THE

EXAMPLE OF FRANCE,

A

WARNING TO BRITAIN.

[Price 2*s*. 6*d*.]

BRITISH MUSEUM

THE

EXAMPLE OF FRANCE,

A

WARNING TO BRITAIN.

Itis a certain, though a ſtrange truth, that in politics all principles that are ſpeculatively right, are practically wrong; the reaſon of which is, that they proceed on a ſuppoſition that men act rationally; which being by no means true, all that is built on ſo falſe a foundation, on experiment, falls to the ground.

SOAME JENYNS.

BY

ARTHUR YOUNG, ESQ. F. R. S.

LONDON:

PRINTED FOR W. RICHARDSON, No. 91, ROYAL EXCHANGE.

M,DCC,XCIII.

BRITISH MUSEUM

THE

EXAMPLE OF FRANCE,

A

WARNING TO BRITAIN.

THE writers who have publiſhed their ſentiments on the events which have paſſed in France ſince the Revolution, have been ſo laviſh of argument, ſo exuberant in theory, that they ſeem to have relied for ſucceſs with their readers, not ſo much on force of facts, as on ingenuity in weaving curious webs of reaſoning. We have had, upon one hand, panegyrics on gallic freedom, with enthuſiaſtic calls to purſue the ſame ſyſtem in order to arrive at the ſame happineſs: on the other hand, every circumſtance of the Revolution, from the original wiſh for liberty, has been condemned and ſatirized with more wit than truth. To

plain men theſe writers ſeem equally removed from that examination, which, attending ſolely to facts, and their immediate or more remote conſequences, is not apt to truſt to the cunning of argument, but looks on every ſide for the more ſolid ſupport of experiment.

I am inclined to think the application of theory to matters of government, a ſurprizing imbecility in the human mind; for men to be ready to truſt to reaſon in enquiries where experiment is equally at hand for their guide, has been pronounced by various great authorities to be in every other ſcience the groſſeſt folly—why the obſervation ſhould not equally extend to the ſcience of legiſlation, will not eaſily appear.

My perſonal purſuit for a long ſeries of years has confirmed me in the habit of experimental enquiry: I have obſerved on ſo many occaſions the fallacy of reaſoning, even when exerted with great force of talents, that I am apt, whenever facts are not clearly diſcerned, to queſtion rather than decide; to doubt much readier than to deliberate; and to value the citation of one new experimented caſe in point, more than an hundred brilliant declamations. Having reſided a good deal in France during the progreſs of the Revolution, to which I was, for ſome time, a warm friend; having paſſed

through

through every province of the kingdom; examined all her principal manufactures; gained much inſtruction relative to the ſtate of her commerce, and attended minutely to the ſituation of her people, it was natural on my return to England to conſult with attention the legiſlative acts of the new government, and to procure by correſpondence and converſation, with perſons on whom I could depend, ſuch intelligence as was neceſſary to enable me to ſatisfy my curioſity concerning the reſult of the moſt ſingular Revolution recorded in the annals of mankind. I ſhould conſider myſelf as a bad ſubject of Britain, if I did not uſe every endeavour to render the knowledge thus acquired, of uſe to my countrymen; and it is ſolely with this view that I now throw together a few ſhort eſſays, inſerted originally in the Annals of Agriculture, ſomewhat improved in form, and with ſuch additions as the events of the period afford.

But in attempting to give expreſſions inadequate to the indignation every one muſt feel at the horrible events now paſſing in France, I am ſenſible that I may be reproached with changing my politics, my "principles," as it has been expreſſed.—My principles I certainly have not changed, becauſe if there is one principle more predominant than another in my politics, it is the *principle of change*. I have been too long a farmer to be go-

verned by any thing but events; I have a conſtitutional abhorrence of theory, of all truſt in abſtract reaſoning; and conſequently a reliance merely on experience, in other words, on events, the only principle worthy of an experimenter. Thus founded on ſure ground, it ſhall be my buſineſs in the enſuing pages, to bring to the reader's notice ſome facts proper to explain

FIRST, the real ſtate of France: and

SECOND, the cauſes of her evils; and I ſhall then apply her example to the landed, monied, commercial, and labouring intereſts of theſe kingdoms.

PRESENT STATE OF FRANCE.

THE facts which will beſt explain this, concern—1. Government. 2. Perſonal Liberty. 3. Security of Property.

Government.

IN all diſcuſſions relative to the new ſyſtem of conſtitution or government in France, it is neceſſary firſt to enquire whether they have any other ſyſtem than that of anarchy. The circumſtances to which I ſhall allude, tend very ſtrongly to prove

that

that the Jacobin clubs, the general councils of the commons, and the nominal legiſlative convention, appear ſo to divide the ſupreme power among them, while the mob, or *nation*, call it which you pleaſe, act ſo independantly of all three, that, to compliment the reſult with the epithet *government*, would be truly ridiculous. To talk of the Rights of Man, or any other declarations or laws of the Conſtituent Aſſembly, is perfectly beſide all preſent queſtions; the heptarchy is not more out of date. —But let us examine facts as reported by Jacobin authority.

The freedom of elections ſeems to be curiouſly attended to.——Reſolution of the Jacobin club of September 13, ſent to all the clubs of the kingdom: —" Let us not loſe a ſingle moment to prevent, by firm meaſures, the danger of ſeeing theſe new legiſlators oppoſe, with impunity, the ſovereign will of the nation. Let us be inſpired with the ſpirit of the electoral body of Paris, whoſe decrees expreſs, *that a ſcrutiny ſhall be made of the National Convention, for the purpoſe of expelling from its boſom ſuch ſuſpected members as may in their nomination have eſcaped the ſagacity of the primary aſſemblies.*" (*Polit. State*, No. 6. p. 449.)

What a beautiful leſſon is this to the men who complain of our repreſentation in England, and

wiſh it reformed.—Here is a delicious reform, and at the hands of republicans! The world, probably, never contained a proof of more determined confuſion; this is truly a *digeſt of anarchy*. For members to be elected to the Convention under the controul of the commons of Paris, whether they ſhall take their ſeat or not, is curious, and ought to give us the cleareſt conviction, that the Jacobins want no Duke of Brunſwick to be the avenger of the crimes of Paris. None can be ſuch adepts in national miſery, ſuch founders of national ruin, as the people themſelves, whoſe exertions are, with ſingular ingenuity, producing a ſyſtem, in which regulation ſhall produce diſorder, and decrees blood. That the people deſign to legiſlate perſonally for themſelves, cannot be doubted; they mean the Convention to have no power, but an initiative *to propoſe* to the ſovereign body who will accept or reject by the organ of clubs.

It is eaſy to gueſs at the obedience paid to a ſovereign body whoſe election is thus reſpected: The Convention decreed, that all elections ſhould be made by ballot: this was directly diſobeyed by Paris. "Of twenty-five Sections," ſays Barbaroux, Oct. 30, "that have returned an account of the election of a mayor, eighteen have violated that law;

law; and the ſection of the Pantheon has propoſed, ſhould their preſident be called to the bar, to attend him armed."

October 5th, a deputation from that city, thus ſpeak at the bar, demanding the ſpeedy trial of the King. "The men of the 10th of Auguſt will never ſuffer, that thoſe they have inveſted with their confidence, ſhall deſpiſe for an inſtant the ſovereignty of the people; courage is the virtue of a free people; and we will not depart from the principle, that if it is juſt to obey laws, it is juſt alſo to reſiſt deſpots, under whatever maſque they may conceal themſelves: we think it for our intereſt to make our elections *viva voce (a haute voix)*." The miniſter of the interior is forced to write the ſame day to the Convention, "I pray you to take meaſures, to prevent being null and without effect all the demands and requiſitions which I daily make, IN THE NAME OF THE LAW, to the commons of Paris." The miniſter, in the name of the Convention, applied for law; but found the commons of Paris ſtronger than both. "I have ſeen," ſays Cambon, Sept. 25th, "theſe commons rob the national edifices of all their moſt precious effects, without the leaſt regiſter, or note; and when we decreed that theſe effects ſhould be carried to the national treaſure, that decree remained without execution.

" The council general of the commons of Paris," ſays Barrere, Nov. 10, " has ſought to depreſs, by every poſſible means, the national repreſentation. The legiſlative body ſaid, that *that germ of new revolutions ought to diſappear*, and the next day it was obliged to withdraw its decree. It ſaid alſo, *that the gates of Paris ought to be opened that every man might travel freely through the interior of the empire*; but the council general ordered them to be ſhut. The legiſlature decreed *that no more paſſports ſhould be neceſſary*. The council general directly ordered that none ſhould ſtir without a paſſport. *

That the municipalities are in a ſtate of real anarchy appears clearly from different bodies aſſuming the ſame power, while the municipalities of Paris were demanding one ſum of the Convention, *la commune proprement dite*, or ninety-ſix commiſſioners of ſections were demanding another, which induced Kerſaint to explain. *In what anarchy is our adminiſtration plunged. Ought there to be two bodies of repreſentatives of the commons of Paris? the law prohibits it.* * *This is curious; a legal veſtry meets in the church, and is*

* Moniteur, Oct. 28.

oppoſed by another in an alehouſe kitchen, who term themſelves the veſtry, properly called; and one having a taſte of public plunder, the other petition alſo for the ſame thing; ſuch are the bodies that ſeize, and divide, under the epithets of confiſcation, adminiſtration, and ſale, the eſtates and property of emigrants.

The commiſſioners of the ſections of Paris at the bar of the Convention, bully it in the ſeterms: "The time preſſes—the ſtorm forms itſelf." — Thus overturning the government that had been formed on the Rights of Man, which, inſtead of yielding peace and tranquillity, produced only ſtorms, the eternal product of ſuch Revolutions; and the blood that had been ſo laviſhly ſpilled for the *public repoſe*, afforded ſo little, that the miniſter Rolland, writing to the commons of Paris, ſays, *I hear of nothing but conſpiracies and projects of murder, and aſſaſſination* †. *The wicked preached yeſterday, at the ſame moment, in different parts of Paris, pillage and aſſaſſination* ‡. And being ordered by the Convention to report the ſtate of Paris, his expreſſion is *the adminiſtrative bodies, without powers*; *the commons deſpotic*; *the people*

* Moniteur, Oct. 28. † Nov. 3. ‡ Nov. 1.

deceived

deceived; *ſuch is Paris!* * But deceived and ignorant as they were, they thought their *lights* ſufficient to inſtruct the nominal legiſlature; as Marat and his gang were daily declaring that cutting off heads was the *genuine employment of a people*, and denouncing ſo many members of the Convention in the Jacobin clubs, it was debated in the Convention, whether a guard ought not to be drawn from all the eighty-three departments. On this project the commiſſioners of the forty-eight ſections of Paris thus ſpeak (Oct. 19) to the convention. "Proxies of the ſovereign! You ſee before you the deputies of the ſections of Paris. They come to make you underſtand eternal truths. No words—but things! It is propoſed to place you on a level with tyrants—to ſurround you with a diſtinct guard. The ſections of Paris weighing the principles on which the ſovereignty of the people reſides, declare to you that this project is odious and dangerous. We will attack in front ſuch a principle. What audaciouſneſs, to conjecture that the people will conſent to ſuch a decree! What! they propoſe to you conſtitutional decrees, before the exiſtence of the conſtitution! Wait till the law exiſts; and the people have ſanctioned it. Paris has made the Revolution. Paris has given liberty to

* Monit. Oct. 30.

the

the reſt of France. *Paris knows how to maintain it* *."

Here Paris expreſsly declares to the Convention, that their decrees were waſte paper till the people ſanction them: ſuch is perſonal repreſentation; an aſſembly is ſo elected, and the people no ſooner poſſeſs ſuch repreſentatives than, intoxicated with power, they declare their deputies things of ſtraw, and their decrees null till ſanctioned by the people themſelves! What a leſſon! to the friends of reform! *In all the public places*, ſays Louvet † *at the Thuilleries, in the Palais de la Revolution, and elſewhere you hear them preach continually inſurrection againſt the national convention. It is high time for us to know*, ſays Cambon, *that the Convention is abſolutely deſpiſed* ‡.

Anarchy, ſaid Baurere ‖, *is at its Zenith:* and Berbaroux §, *Anarchy reigns around us, and we have done nothing to repreſs it. Thoſe who provoke to murder are yet triumphant. Anarchy is the cauſe of all our evils!* Says the PRESIDENT OF THE CONVENTION to the deputation for the department of Indre and Loire **.

Theſe are the accounts and the words of the members of the Convention openly delivered; but

* Monit. Oct. 21. † Oct. 29. ‡ Monit. Dec. 29.
Oct. 30. § Oct. 30. ** Monit. Dec. 4.

we

we have a reformer in England, who characterizes the French government with the epithets of, "the erect mien and heavenly dignity of aſpect—the fair and enchanting form—the viſion ſo delightful."—It is whimſical enough, that while the French find their government a mere anarchy of murderers and banditti; our Engliſh reformers ſhould delineate it as the peculiar diſpenſation of Providence ſhowering bleſſings on mankind. That while the adminiſtrators of the department of Calvados, tell the Convention that Paris *is the focus of inſurrection, vengeance, and proſcription: that innocent blood has flowed, that villains who are the deteſtation of the nation, and will be the opprobium of poſterity, ſtill calculate in criminal ſilence the life and death of citizens* †, an Engliſhman can be found to declare ſuch a government ſo beneficent, that he can refer it only to the firſt great cauſe of all ‡!

From ſuch a polluted fountain, it is eaſy to ſuppoſe what ſtreams muſt flow; and that all parts of France have been ſcenes either of inſurrection, of plunder, or of blood; the inſtances of Marſeilles, Lyons, Avignon, Arles, Rouen, Caen, Bourdeaux, Nancy, Liſle, and a long liſt of other ci-

† Oct. 20.

‡ Major Cartwright to the Duke of Newcaſtle.

ties,

ties, are notorious: it may not be ſo generally known that at Charleville the colonel commandant was murdered *. That at Creſſy all was riot and violence †. That at Cambray the lieutenant colonel Beſombre was murdered by the Gens d'armes, and captain Logros' head was on a bayonette ‡. That the rebellion in Poitou was of 10,000 ‖, and that of Chartres double. More ſingular than theſe is the caſe of D'Hoté, who being condemned only to the ſtocks for four hours by the *jury de jugement*, for crimes that merited an hundred deaths, being expoſed on the Place de Greve, demanded of the populace *Liberty or death*; the mob, in ſpite of the Gens d'armes, mounted the ſcaffold, cut the cords of the criminal, and carried him off in triumph. *When*, ſays the editor of the Moniteur, reporting it, *will the people feel the neceſſity of reſpecting the laws?* §

Such is the reſult of that conſtitution, founded on perſonal repreſentation, which has been boaſted as the pride and glory of legiſlation. Such are the effects that form the comment on ſo many hundred books and pamphlets publiſhed in praiſe of an edifice erected on the Rights of Man!— And of which we may ſay, with truth and moderation, that it has brought more miſery, poverty,

* Sept. 4. † Oct. 17. ‡ Oct. 10.
‖ Monit. Oct. 15. § Monit. Oct. 29.

devaſtation, impriſonment, bloodſhed, and ruin on France, in four years, than the old government did in a century.

Such is the government that has been contraſted by Paine to the *no* conſtitution of England. Every thing with us, according to him, has a conſtitution except the nation; and, if we had a conſtitution, we ſhould be able to produce it. The French, on the contrary, formed one which they could produce, printed on vellum, and bound in morocco; carried by every one in his pocket, as the charter of his Rights; but unfortunately for theories of government, this great effort of legiſlation; this boaſt of French, and envy of Engliſh Jacobins, this maſter-piece of the metaphyſical ART of Abbé Sieyés; this quinteſcence of what *ought to be*, in oppoſition to *what is* *; this fine machine pronounced by ſo many pens immortal; producible to the meaſure of Paine, *antecedent to the government, and diſtinct from it*; this capital production of gallic genius endured ſcarcely two years. The freedom it afforded was not ſufficient for adepts in the Rights of Man: The exiſtence of a King, becauſe offenſive to the new lights by which they were illumined. Inſurrection

* La phyſique ne peut être que la connoiſſance de *ce qui eſt*. L'art plus hardi demande *ce qui doit être* pour l'utilité des hommes.

was

was pronounced a ſacred duty;—revolt followed; —and the horrors that will for ever ſtain the annals of mankind,—the *deep damnation* that enſued,—are written in every heart from which Jacobiniſm has not eradicated all traces of feeling and humanity. Such has been the PRACTICE of the French revolution; for its THEORY go to *Rights of Man.*

Yet theſe infamies of abſtract and ideal perfection are not black enough to deter men from boldly, in the full face of government and of day, ſetting their names to ſuch ſentiments as theſe, in which the Britiſh conſtitution and its friends are thus characteriſed: —— "The mad councils of rage and deſperation." — "Maimed, mutilated, mangled, and wretched condition." — "Scanty fragments, loathſome offals are all of freedom that of the people England taſte."—"Mendicants ſubſiſting on crumbs."—"Viſions of ſlaughtered citizens and a pillaged nation." — "Happy Frenchmen! How long will Engliſhmen endure the ſhame of ſeeing their houſe of repreſentatives a ſhocking contraſt to models ſo pure!"—Not even plauſible *conceſſion* will now, in my humble opinion, put the people off their guard, and *compromiſe* will be received as inſult. Their demand is their rights. They are taking their cauſe into their own hands. They want no patrons; and their friends will be

their

their ſervants. Their operations are infallible, their ſtrength will ſoon be invincible." — Among the diſcoveries of theſe pregnant times, it has been found out that men may live and thrive without lords; that the ſun will ſhine and the dew will deſcend where there are none but equal citizens to partake of theſe bleſſings; and that even good laws can be made, and juſtice well adminiſtered, without either hereditary legiſlators or hereditary judges *!"

Would any perſon conceive it poſſible, that the paſſages here collected, expreſſive of the warmeſt deteſtation, were not applied to France, as being moſt peculiarly adapted to mark the ſtate of that kingdom weltering in its beſt blood, rather than to one in ſo ſingular a ſtate of proſperity as England?

When our deſtruction is threatened ſo openly— when ſo clear an explanation is given of the REAL meaning and intentions of the reforming ſocieties —and when the operations and ſtrength of the rabble are ſo ſoon to be INVINCIBLE, it ſurely behoves the government of this country to awaken to danger ſo imminent; to menaces ſo audacious; and to a licentiouſneſs of publication, which, whatever the intention, muſt, if unreſtrained, let looſe

* Major Cartwright's Letter to the Duke of Newcaſtle.

the dæmons of diſcord, the hell hounds of the mob, to the utter deſtruction of all that flouriſhes at preſent in this kingdom.

" The generality of governments," ſays Dr. Prieſtley, " have hitherto been little more than a combination of *the few* againſt *the many*; and to the mean paſſions and low cunning of theſe few, have the greateſt intereſts of mankind been too long ſacrificed. Whole nations have been deluged with blood, and every ſource of future proſperity has been drained, to gratify the caprices of ſome of the moſt deſpicable, or the moſt execrable of the human ſpecies. For what elſe have been the generality of kings, their miniſters of ſtate, or their miſtreſſes, to whoſe wills whole kingdoms have been ſubject? What can we ſay of thoſe who have hitherto taken the lead in conducting the affairs of nations, but that they have commonly been either *weak* or *wicked*, and ſometimes both? Hence the common reproach of all hiſtories, that they exhibit little more than a view of the vices and miſeries of mankind. From this time, therefore, we may expect that it will wear a different and more pleaſing aſpect *."

The events which have paſſed ſince this paſſage was written, muſt make one ſmile in reading it. It

* Letters to the Right Hon. Edmund Burke, p. 144.

now appears that the combination of the *many* againſt the *few*, can alſo deluge a nation in blood, with a cruelty more accurſed, becauſe unneceſſary to the many: that ſources of proſperity can be drained without miniſters and without miſtreſſes; that weakneſs and wickedneſs can take the lead without kings; and that hiſtory will ſtill continue to exhibit the vices and miſeries of mankind.

Perſonal Security.

THE ſtate of France reſpecting the perſonal liberty of her citizens is diſpatched in few words: THERE IS NO SUCH THING: the fact is ſo notorious, that an appeal to inſtances might by many be deemed unneceſſary; there are, however, a few circumſtances that merit nothing, not ſo much to prove the violation of this firſt and moſt ſacred duty of government, as to ſhew that ſuch violations have been committed on *principle*; and perpetrated or permitted even by the legiſlature itſelf.

The declaration of the Rights of Man and of Citizens ſays, *no man can be accuſed, arreſted, or detained, except in caſes determined by the law, and* ACCORDING TO THE FORMS WHICH THE LAW HAS PRESCRIBED. Such is the letter: what is the practice? On complaints from Niort, againſt ſome counter revolutioniſts,

ſeized by a mob thirſting for their blood, but who wiſhed to have the flimſy cloak of a ſemblance of juſtice, the NATIONAL ASSEMBLY decreed, " that all the criminal tribunals of the kingdom ſhould try, without appeal, all crimes committed againſt the Revolution *. And in order to indulge the ſame thirſt at Paris, which was not with all its murders ſatiated, they decreed the removal of the criminals from Orleans to Paris; that is, from the legally eſtabliſhed judicature, where there was a chance of juſtice, to an illegal one, where there was no ſuch chance; and they did this in conſequence of ſuch addreſſes as theſe from the deputation of the commons of Paris. *It is time that the criminals, at Orleans, be transferred to Paris, there to receive the puniſhment of their crimes. If you do not agree to this demand we cannot anſwer* for the vengeance of the people. *You have heard us, and you know that inſurrection is a ſacred duty!* Invited to the honours of the meeting!!! The fate of theſe priſoners is known to every one.

The declaration ſays, that *no man can be puniſhed but in virtue of a law eſtabliſhed, and promulgated prior to the offence, and legally applied.* The application, " diſobedience" in the colonies, " ſhall be regarded as high treaſon, and thoſe who ſhall render themſelves guilty ſhall be ſent to France to

* Mont. 31ſt.

be tried according to the rigour of the law." The liberty of the preſs was provided for in the declaration. Such the theory. The practice was ſilencing all that were not *Jacobin* papers, and beheading the authors. No wonder, with ſuch ſpecies of government, that priſons ſhould be emptied by maſſacre, and filled again by arbitrary arreſts. Sept. 16, the miniſter writes thus to the Aſſembly: " The natural, civil, and political liberty of the nation is in queſtion; ſince the 5th, above five hundred perſons have been arreſted, ſo that the priſons are as full as ever *; no ſatisfactory account is given of the authority; they have been impriſoned by orders given by the municipality by ſections, by the people, and even by individuals: *empriſonneés par ordre, ſoit de la municipalité, ſoit des ſections, ſoit du peuple*, SOIT MEME D'INDIVIDUS; and the reaſons of very few of theſe orders are given."

The legiſlature thus informed of the abuſe, may be preſumed on the wing to remedy it. The progreſs of the buſineſs is curious:—Oct. 8. Decree—" The National Convention decrees, that citizens

* Contraſt this with the SEVEN priſoners (four of them not *ſtate* ones), the whole number found in the Baſtile when forced by the mob!!!

detained

detained in houſes, which are neither priſons nor houſes of arreſt, ſhall be removed within fifteen days into legal priſons; after which time every citizen, againſt whom there appears neither warrant of arreſt, nor decree of accuſation, ſhall be ſet at liberty *." If any doubts could remain of the real tyranny under which France groans, ſuch a decree would be ſufficient to remove them: — the fact of citizens being thus illegally confined, without warrant, and not in legal priſons, is here admitted; and men SO treated may be kept fifteen days longer before they are ſet free! Sept. 16, the Convention receives the notice officially, and Oct. 8, they decree a power of arbitrary impriſonment fifteen days longer!! — Nor does it end here; for Nov. 11, complaint is heard in the Aſſembly, that *no report is made concerning the priſoners* †; and it merits great attention, that during this long period of the impriſonment of ſo many unhappy people, Paris was inceſſantly convulſed; and every day brought reaſon to expect, that impriſonment and ſlaughter would prove ſynonimous terms. To impriſon whom they pleaſed on ſuſpicion, as a means of taking off thoſe they dared not, or could not publicly accuſe, was a convenient mode of tyranny, not unworthy of the wretch, a member of their Pandemonium, who,

* Monit. Oct. 9. † Monit. Nov. 13.

ſpeaking to the queſtion of trying the unhappy King, aſſigned him to torments in the hearing of thoſe tribunes, who might ſoon be the executioners of his bloody wiſhes. *Moriſſon*, " the firſt and moſt natural of all my affections would be to ſee, that ſanguinary monſter (Louis XVI.) expiate his guilt by the moſt cruel torments *: and another (*Gonchon*, Dec. 12.) ſays, *Kings will paſs away! but the declaration of rights and pikes will never paſs away. Here let the tyrant hear his condemnation*, as if the declaration of rights was not laid in the duſt, when ſuch language could be ſpoken of a priſoner unheard; and amidſt *unanimous and reiterated applauſes!* The applauſes of thoſe whoſe pikes were ready.

In the full teeth of ſuch authentic facts, given on the authority of their own miniſters and friends, we read, in the *Political State of Europe*, printed by Jordan, and written by Paine and Co. No. 6. p. 435, that in Paris a reſpect is paid to the ſacred preſervation of property, and that the laws are *no where ſo univerſally reſpected and obeyed!!!* What will not Jacobin impudence reach!

Such has been the attention to perſonal liberty, under the reign of philoſophers, eſtabliſhed on the

* Monit. Nov. 14.

ruins

ruins of the mildeſt and moſt benignant government in Europe, our own only excepted; a government cruelly libelled in the character given by one of our reforming orators, who thus deſcribes it; "a ſpecies of government that trampled on the property, the liberty, and the lives of its ſubjects; that dealt in extortions, dungeons, and tortures: and that prepared, beforehand, a day of ſanguinary vengeance *." Epithets and expreſſions ſo ſingularly applicable to the fabric erected by the Revolution, that one can with difficulty believe it poſſible that they were meant for any other.

Security of Property.

If I had not heard Jacobin converſation in England, there would have been little occaſion for this paragraph; to a reader that reflects, it muſt at once be apparent that where there is no perſonal freedom, there can be no ſecure property: It would be an inſult to common ſenſe to ſuppoſe, that a tyrannical mob would reſpect the property of thoſe whoſe throats they cut: arbitary impriſonment and maſſacre muſt be inevitably followed by direct attacks on property. Contrary however to theſe plain deductions of common ſenſe, it has been

* Mr. Sheridan's Speech.

repeatedly aſſerted, that the government of France has done nothing in violation of the rights of property, except with relation to emigrants, who were conſidered as guilty for the act of flying: But is it not palpable, at the firſt bluſh, that filling priſons on ſuſpicion, by arbitrary commitments, and emptying them by maſſacre—that the perpetual din of pillage and aſſaſſination—are calculated to fill men with alarm and terror—and to drive them to fly not thro' guilt, but horror? By your murders you drive them away; and then pronouncing them emigrants, confiſcate their eſtates! And this is called the ſecurity of property. The cry of ariſtocrate or traitor is followed by immediate impriſonment or death, and has been found an eaſy way of paying debts: Enquiring of a correſpondent what was become of a gentleman I had known at Paris; the anſwer was, that he was met in the ſtreet by a perſon conſiderably in his debt, who no ſooner ſaw than he attacked him as a traitor, and ordered him to goal. No known maſſacre was committed in that priſon, but my acquaintance was heard of no more. It is eaſy to conjecture what became of the debt. Should the dæmons of diſcord effect a revolution in this kingdom, and bring Mr. Legiſlator Paine once more to Thetford, Sandwich, or Lewes, he would not find it difficult thus to ſatisfy all his creditors, however numerous — he would

would come well prepared with a French recipe for wiping off all their *ſcores*. In a country where ſuch things are poſſible, every tie that binds property is broken. To imagine its ſecurity is a folly too groſs to be endured, and to aſſert it a falſehood that ſhould excite no emotion but contempt.

In a pariſh in the Clermontois *(Croté-le-Roy)* the ſteward of a gentleman reſiding at a diſtance, came to receive the rent of three conſiderable farmers. He was told that the Convention had decreed equality, and that paying rent was the moſt unequal thing in the world; for it was a man who did much to receive a little, paying to one, who receiving much, did nothing at all. The ſteward replied, that their joke might poſſibly be good, but that he came not for wit, but money; and money he muſt have; he was ordered inſtantly to depart or to ſtay and be hanged. The proprietor demanded juſtice, but in vain; the municipality was applied to; and the only reſult was, that body (the veſtry) ordering the farmers to yield up the land; they were taken poſſeſſion of by themſelves in depoſit redeemable for the nation; and actually divided in portions among the labouring poor, that is among themſelves. What the event may be is nothing to the purpoſe: What becomes in the mean time of the Right of Property! The probable

bable event however is, that the proprietor will be driven to emigration, for the mere convenience of retaining their plunder.

It can hardly be doubted but that robbery, even of land itſelf, muſt ſpread all the kingdom when the committee of general ſecurity could thus report to the Convention: — *The national reſources may be augmented by impoſing contributions upon perſons of fortune*, perſonnes aiſees *and the obſtinate who wait tranquilly at home the event of the Revolution* *. Contributions impoſed on perſons for two reaſons; firſt, for the crime of being men of fortune; and, ſecondly, for remaining in tranquillity! With ſuch a legiſlation can property be reſpected?

With ſuch a principle, recognized in the Convention, we need not aſk how taxes are levied. The poor and ſmall proprietors of a few acres, who every where form the majority of each municipality, eſcape all taxation, but are vigilant in forcing thoſe of more conſiderable property to pay to the laſt farthing; and as all taxes are aſſeſſed and levied by the parochial vote, at aſſemblies, to which *all* reſort, the men without property order every thing at will, and have various ways, much

* Oct. 18, Monit.

more

more effective, for the diviſion of property than a direct agrarian would be.

Let the farmers of this kingdom repreſent to themſelves a picture of what their ſituation would be, if their labourers, their ſervants, and the paupers whom they ſupport by poors-rates, were all armed, and, in ſome meaſure, regimented, and in poſſeſſion of the veſtry, voting not only the money to be raiſed by rates, but the diviſion of it among themſelves; decreeing what the price of all the farmer's products ſhould be; what wages ſhould be paid to ſervants, and what pay to labourers. Under ſuch a ſyſtem of government I beg to aſk, what ſecurity would remain for a ſingle ſhilling in the pockets of thoſe who are at preſent in a ſtate of eaſe and affluence? And whether ſuch a tyranny would not be worſe than that of the moſt determined deſpotiſm at preſent in Europe?

While the farmer is thus expoſed to parochial oppreſſion, at the mercy of thoſe who were ſo lately his inferiors, and who are even fed and ſupported by him, he is not exempted from attacks of a very different nature; to authorize the ſeizure of horſes and arms was, in the National Aſſembly, a meaſure of violence and tyranny; but as it iſſued

ſeized

from the legiſlature *de facto*, it had the authority of admitted power; but the municipality of Paris have gone much further; September 13, the miniſter of the home department complains to the Aſſembly, that the commiſſioners of the municipality of Paris, are ſent into the country with ſuch arbitrary orders as are utterly inconſiſtent with his own reſponſibility; their orders are ſigned by four of the adminiſtrators of the public ſafety, for ſeizing ſuſpected perſons and precious effects. *Pour s'emparer des perſonnes ſuſpectes & des effets precieux* *. Seizing ſuſpected perſons and precious effects! A very pretty commiſſion in a land of liberty; and given, not by the legiſlative body, but by a corporation! The corporation of a town ſends commiſſioners, in other words, deſpotic monarchs, into the country, to arreſt and to plunder, and this under the noſe of the legiſlature. When the republican reader of Mr. Paine, on corporations in England, is well ſatiated with *rights*, it would do him good to take the actions of French municipalities as a comment on the text.

The watch-word, from one end of France to the other, is *equality*; they join liberty with it, as mountebanks annex a favourite epithet to the noſtrum, whoſe only object is the money in the pockets of

* Monit. Sept. 14.

the

the credulous. But after all rank, title, nobility, and diſtinction have been aboliſhed, what do they mean by equality? The word is abſurd, if it attaches not to property, for there can be no equality while one man is rich and another poor. But the preceding facts ſpeak what the new equality is in terms too clear to be miſunderſtood. *I am not aſtoniſhed to ſee*, ſays Buzot, *an arret come to us under the name of Momoro, who I, as preſident in the department of Eure, heard preaching the diviſion of eſtates; but I am truly ſo to find ſuch a man preſiding in one of the ſections of Paris* *.

We hear it aſſerted in England, that property is not attacked in France: *There* you hear no ſuch aſſertions: on the return of the commiſſioners, members of the Convention, from the riots at Chartres, where they were nearly deſtroyed, it was aſſerted on facts in the Convention itſelf, *that all the principles of an Agrarian law were in agitation* mis en avance †.

Before we quit this ſubject of the ſecurity of property at preſent in France, let us examine ſhortly the caſe of that moſt intereſting portion of property, the crop in the hands of the farmer: we know well in England, from the conviction of long

* Monit. Oct. 13. † Monit. Dec. 2.

experience,

experience, that if this ſpecies of property is not ſacred, all the claſſes of the ſociety inſtantly ſuffer; it is a vital wound that affects the whole ſyſtem.

The late crop in that kingdom is ſaid to be plentiful; but natural plenty, under a government of anarchy, avails little; the mob prohibiting the free tranſport of corn, the immediate conſequence was ſo high a price in many diſtricts, that the people found it more convenient to *ſeize* the corn than to *pay* for it: this, of courſe, added every where to the miſchief; for the farmers were not ready to carry their products into the jaws of plunder. Theſe diſtractions—theſe bleſſings of a government that had the power of converting even good crops into the means of famine, drew from the miniſter of the home department threats even of violence; he wrote to a variety of cities, from all which papers it would be too tedious to give extracts. He thus expreſſes himſelf to Tours: "The municipalities ought to uſe all poſſible means of perſuaſion with the farmers, for engaging them to ſupply the markets; for I muſt tell you, that if the poſſeſſors of corn reſiſt theſe *paternal* invitations, MEANS OF EXTREMITY muſt be uſed againſt them: *on ſera bien contraint d'employer envers eux les moyens extremes**." It is worth the attention of Engliſh farmers, to reflect

* Monit. Sept. 17.

well

well on the nature of this caſe: their brethren in France, content with a moderate and fair price for their corn, carry it freely to market; the operations of the people raiſe this price; and then, to revenge the reſult of their own violence, they plunder. Such a conduct is ſure to create, at leaſt, apprehenſions of famine; and to obviate it, the miniſter does not threaten the mob, from whom all the miſchief ariſes, but the FARMERS; he threatens them with EXTREMITIES, as a puniſhment for having been plundered by the rabble—by the *nation*. If the farmer, thus robbed, has the misfortune to be a proprietor, and particularly a large proprietor, he has firſt the oppreſſion of paying thoſe taxes which an armed populace will not pay; and, that he may be able to do this, his corn is ſeized by the conſumer, and he is threatened with extremities by the miniſter; as if any extremities could be greater than taking his crops by violence: if more, however, was not meant, the folly of the denunciation was equal to the knavery of it. Thoſe intellects which can ſee any difference between ſuch a government and the cudgel of a Turkiſh baſha, are much more acute than mine.

The ſame miniſter wrties to the Convention, Oct. 15.—"I am informed that the overſeers of the military ſubſiſtences do not ceaſe to fly through

the

the country, and to force, with arms in their hands, the farmers to furniſh their commodities. Such practices deſtroy every meaſure of order, and infinitely impede the free circulation of corn. I cannot diſſemble with the Convention, that this conduct of the military contractors tends to ſpread diſorder every where, and that if they continue to take by force, or at their own price, proviſion from the farmers, it will be impoſſible to inſure the ſupply of Paris."

Now this, if poſſible, exceeds every thing the Jacobin adminiſtration, acting on the ideas of Jacobin liberty, could deviſe to ſhew their perfect contempt of the whole farming race. He ſtates the glaring magnitude of the evil to the Convention; and what is his concluſion? Why he tells them, that if ſuch things are allowed, it will *be impoſſible to ſupply Paris!!* There is the only evil; as to the poor plundered farmers, he allows, indeed, that robbing them is *a diſorder*, but when he ſums up to impreſs the legiſlature with the neceſſity of paying attention to the evil, he recurs ſolely to the ſupply of Paris! If Paris is ſupplied, all is well—as to the farmers, they may take care of themſelves. Let thoſe who tell us in England, that the Revolution of France was favourable in the beginning to agriculture (particularly in tythes) conſider the value of a FREE

MARKET;

MARKET; and then our farmers will not be long diſcovering, that no exemptions, no ſuch favours will prove a recompenſe, for being forced, the pike or broad-ſword in hand, to ſell at the price offered by thoſe who brandiſh the weapon over their heads. No wonder that ſuch meaſures ſhould ſtarve the towns, as well as ruin the country; and that the commiſſioners of ſubſiſtence ſhould report, that *the penury of grain in the great cities is extreme* *.

In all theſe and a thouſand other inſtances, we ſee the living and effective conſequences of Paine's doctrines; he expatiated on the luxury of great eſtates, and recommended their ſeizure; French practice realized the doctrine, and doubtleſs there were French farmers, who rejoiced at the ſpectacle of all the great properties of the kingdom being levelled by the nation; they did not however foreſee, that it would be their own turn next; that the principle of equality being once abroad, would infallibly level ALL property; and would give to the beggar, without a loaf, but with a pike on his ſhoulder, the means of levelling the enormous inequality between his own wallet without a kernel, and the well-ſtored grainery of a warm farmer. Let ours, therefore, never forget, that the ſame princi-

* Monit. Nov. 16.

ple which attacks a property of 40,000l. a year, becauſe it is too large relatively to other properties, attacks alſo a farm of 200l. a year, for the ſame reaſon; nay, of 50l. a year, becauſe that alſo is large, when compared with the property of thoſe who have little. And let us all be well perſuaded, that the fearful events at preſent paſſing in France, with a celerity of miſchief that ſurpaſſes equally all that hiſtory has to offer, or fancy to conceive, afford a ſpectacle intereſting to every man who poſſeſſes PROPERTY; and to none more than to farmers. The quarrel now raging in that once flouriſhing kingdom, is not between liberty and tyranny, or between protecting and oppreſſive ſyſtems of government; it is, on the contrary, collected to a ſingle point,—it is alone a queſtion of property; it is a trial at arms, whether thoſe who have *nothing* ſhall not ſeize and poſſeſs the property of thoſe who have *ſomething*. A dreadful queſtion—a horrid ſtruggle, which can never end but in the equal and univerſal ruin of all; in which, he who gains by the loſs of his neighbour, gains but to loſe, in his turn, to ſome ſturdier robber, till riot, confuſion, and anarchy render property but the ſignal of invaſion, and poverty the beſt ſhield againſt the attacks and tyranny of the mob *.

Such

* Purſue the declaration of rights through every article, and it will be found that there is not a ſingle article regiſtered as an impre-

Such being the ſtate of government, liberty, and property in France, I ſhall unite theſe facts in one general concluſion, and venture the aſſertion, that the Revolution has abſolutely ruined that kingdom. I may be told, perhaps, in reply, that ſhe carries no more appearance of ruin at this moment, than many months or years paſt. Her arms are even victorious on every ſide.

The inquiry into that degree of depreſſion or violence which properly conſtitutes national ruin, would lead into an extenſive and unneceſſary diſcuſſion. If nothing merits the epithet but foreign conqueſt, Morocco was in no ſtate of ruin under a barbarian, who put 40,000 men to death with his own hands; nor is Turkey ruined under the

impreſcriptible right of man, that has not been violated under circumſtances of the moſt odious and abominable cruelty.

An Engliſhman is proud of the idea of his houſe being his caſtle; ſee the practice of *Jacobin* government in this reſpect! "Decreed, that the municipalities are authorized to ſearch the houſes of all perſons for arms, and to take an account of horſes and carriages applicable to the war." And ſoon after their abſolute ſeizure decreed. This was ſounding the alarm bell, in order to give up the houſes of all the gentlemen in the kingdom to the plunder of brigands; and this by the legiſlature itſelf—elected by perſonal repreſentation.

If we are aſked what apology the tyrants of Paris have to make for their actions, their anſwer is STATE EXPEDIENCY; which an Engliſh reformer calls the *offspring of hell.*

dominion of horſe-tails and bow-ſtrings. To every purpoſe of ſober argument, the danger of life and property is effective ruin.

Life and property in France are in this ſituation, if raiſed a ſingle point above the level of the populace; a gigantic and devouring deſpotiſm has levelled in the duſt all ſecurity to thoſe whoſe properties raiſe them above the mob. In one word, LAW does not reign; there is a power every where ſuperior: a deſpotic authority may fill the ranks of their armies, as the ſlaves of Algiers are made to arm and to fight, but the kingdom is as much ruined with victory attending her ſtandard, as if the German banners were flying at Paris, Marſeilles and Bourdeaux.

The old government of France, with all its faults, was certainly the beſt enjoyed by any conſiderably country in Europe, England alone excepted; but there were many faults in it which every claſs of the people wiſhed to remedy: This natural and laudable wiſh made Democrates in every order, amongſt the poſſeſſors of property, as well as among thoſe who had none. At the commencement of the Revolution, France poſſeſſed a very flouriſhing commerce; the richeſt colonies in the world; the greateſt currency of ſolid money in Europe; her agriculture was improving; and

her people, tho' from too great population much too numerous for the higheſt degrees of national proſperity, yet were more at their eaſe than in many other countries of Europe; the government was regular and mild; and what was of as much conſequence as all the reſt her benignant ſovereign, with a patriotiſm unequalled, was really willing to improve, by any reaſonable means, the conſtitution of the kingdom. All theſe circumſtances, if compared with England, would not make the proper impreſſion. They are to be compared alone with what has ſince enſued; and her preſent ſtate may thus, with truth, be correctly deſcribed. — Her government an anarchy, that values neither life nor property. Her agriculture faſt ſinking, her farmers the ſlaves of all; and her people ſtarving. Her manufactures annihilated. Her commerce deſtroyed; and her colonies abſolutely ruined. Her gold and ſilver diſappeared, and her currency paper ſo depreciated, by its enormous amount of 3000 millions, beſides incredible forgeries, that it advances, with rapid ſtrides, to the entire ſtagnation of every ſpecies of induſtry and circulation. Her national revenue diminiſhed three-fourths. Her cities ſcenes of revolt of maſſacre and ſtarvation; and her provinces plundered by gangs of banditti. Her future proſpect of peace and ſettlement, depending on a conſtitution that is to be *formed* by a convention of rabble, and *ſanctioned* by the *ſans culottes* of the

kennel. It is not a few inſulated crimes on ſome undeſerving men; it is a ſeries of horrid proſcription, ſpreading far and near; pervading every quarter of the kingdom; it is the annihilation of rank, of right, of property; it is the deſtruction of the poſſeſſors of more than half France; it is the legiſlation of wolves, that govern only in deſtruction: and all theſe maſſacres, and plunderings, and burnings, and horrors of every denomination, are ſo far from being neceſſary for the eſtabliſhment of liberty, that they have moſt effectually deſtroyed it. In one word, France is at preſent abſolutely without government; anarchy reigns; the poniard and the pike of the mob give the law to all that once formed the higher claſſes, and to all that at preſent mocks with the ſhew of legiſlation. The mob of Paris have been long in the actual poſſeſſion of unrivalled power; they will never freely relinguiſh it: if the Convention preſumes to be free, it will be maſſacred; and, after a circle of new horrors, will ſink (ſhould foreign aid fail) into the deſpotiſm of triumvirs or dictators: the change will be from a Bourbon to a butcher!

"All former Revolutions," ſays Paine, "till the American had been worked within the atmoſphere of a court, and never on the great floor of a nation;"* unfortunately for this miſerable copy,

* Rights of Man.

ſhe

ſhe worked on a floor broad enough; her baſis was the blood and property of France. The picture has no reſemblance in "the *inſipid* ſtate of hereditary government." She found in "ſcenes of horror and perfection of iniquity," what "man is up to." It is eaſy to ſee what they have loſt; as to their gains, they have aſſignats, cocades, and the muſic of *ci ira*; it may be truly ſaid, that they have made a wiſe barter: they have given their gold for paper; their bread for a ribbon, and their blood for a ſong. Heaven preſerve us from the phrenzy of ſuch exchanges! and leave Revolutions for the "order of the day," for "the morning of reaſon riſing upon man" † in France.

II.

Such are the conſequences of the French Revolution; our next enquiry is, from what have theſe evils ariſen? They may be attri-

* The Convention declares, in the name of the French nation, that they will grant aſſiſtance to all people that wiſh to recover their liberty, and charges the executive power with giving the neceſſary orders to the generals for giving ſuccour to ſuch people, Nov. 19. ordered to be printed in all languages.

† Paine.

buted to three prominent features in the new ſyſtem of their *ſoi-diſant* philoſophers.—1. Perſonal Repreſentation,—2. The Rights of Man.—3. Equality.

If there is any one circumſtance to which all the horrors that have paſſed in France may be more properly attributed than to any other, it is the double repreſentation given to the *tiers etat* by Mr. Neckar, directly contrary to every reſpectable authority. The preponderancy of the people within the walls, united with the ſpirit of revolt without, was manifeſt in a moment; the court divided; and the King, conſcientious and honeſt; theſe were not arms to meet the preſſure of the moment. The mob triumphed; and all the world knows what followed. If a tree is to be judged by its fruits, we may fairly aſſert, that perſonal repreſentation, which gives to the loweſt of the people a direct influence in the government, muſt lead in a great empire and a great capital to abſolute anarchy, ſuch as has ruined France.

In any repreſentative government, if perſons only are repreſented, — that is to ſay, if a man without a ſhilling deputes equally with another who has property, and if men in the former ſituation are ten times more numerous than thoſe in the latter; and if the repreſentatives ſo choſen, ſit for

ſo

ſo ſhort a time as to vote truly the wills of their conſtituents, it follows, by direct conſequence, that all the property of the ſociety is at the mercy of thoſe who poſſeſs nothing; and could theory have blundered ſo ſtupidly as to ſuppoſe for a moment, that attack and plunder would not follow power in ſuch hands; let it recur to France for *fact*, to prove what reaſon ought to have foreſeen.

The abſtract Rights of Man, moſt prepoſterous of all ideas, which in fact have no *political* exiſtence whatever, have effected all the miſchief ſince thoſe rights, which cannot be exerted, or become efficient without the deſtruction of other rights, and the rights of other men, equally admitted are palpably viſionary—the children of playful brains—but impoſſible in practice. But the French had theſe dreams; they imagined that perſonal repreſentation would recognize and ſecure ſuch rights, and they eſtabliſhed their government accordingly:—they ridiculed the conſtitution of England for depending on a balance of powers; in which a *corporation of ariſtocracy* has a negative on the Rights of Man; and wove a web of theory from the phantaſy of their brains, to ſecure thoſe rights from all controul.

Is this caſe in point? Is this a great political experiment on perſonal repreſentation?

Let

Let the works of Mr. Mackintoſh, Mr. Chriſtie, and many other able writers, who have printed warm panegyrics on the French conſtitution, anſwer this queſtion. They have anſwered it deciſively; for the faults found, if any, are that the repreſentation was not perſonal enough; the reſult has ſhewn it *ſo* perſonal, as to have annihilated property; this part of the queſtion therefore is decided as ſoon as propoſed.

There is a party in this kingdom who call loudly for a reform in the repreſentation of the people, and who would have ſuch reformation give a right of election indiſcriminately to all mankind: I am myſelf in the number of thoſe who wiſh a reform, but not of ſuch a complexion, nor at a moment like this; I wiſh the middle claſſes of landed property better repreſented; I wiſh a new member for every county, elected by men who poſſeſs not leſs than an hundred a year in land, and not more than a thouſand; and an equal number of members deducted from the moſt objectionable boroughs. But I would live at Conſtantinople rather than at Bradfield, if the wild and prepoſterous propoſitions founded on the Rights of Man, were to become effective in this kingdom. In other words, I have property; and I do not chooſe to live where the firſt beggar I met may, the ſabre in one hand, and

Rights

Rights of Man in the other, demand a ſhare of that which a good government tells me is *my own.*

The fact is, that the French conſtitution was founded *abſolutely* on perſonal repreſentation. By the letter of the law, certain perſons were excluded, but by collateral parts of the ſame ſyſtem, the mob was armed; and the authors of the Revolution might not perhaps foreſee the event, that elections made at the point of the bayonet, would be at the power of the bayonet. Examine not the letter of a viſionary code, but EXPERIMENT, in the hiſtory of Paris, Marſeilles, &c. from the firſt moment of the troubles.

That many who wiſh the reform, on popular principles, of that parliament; under the auſpices of which we enjoy the ſecurity which makes us every hour (of anarchy in France) the object of the envy of other nations—that many who wiſh this reform, do it on meritorious motives, I have not a doubt:—they think, on theory, that perſonal repreſentation may be conſiſtent with the ſecurity of property; much as they are deceived in this idea, yet their error was once reſpectable*. They ſay

* Of ſuch men, conſiſted many of the Conſtituent Aſſembly in France; but the abſolute folly of the idea is now a matter of experiment:

ſay to themſelves, ſo far I would go and no farther *; but they forget, that by going ſo far they have

periment: that aſſembly made the trial. They formed a government on the *Rights of Man*, and the foundation they built upon was ſo ſlippery, that the whole edifice has tumbled about their ears in a ſingle year. I hardly know any thing more nauſeous than the converſation one now and then hears at preſent on thoſe fine theories, delivered pretty much in the ſame accents as a twelvemonth ago, when the Conſtituent Aſſembly was as much praiſed as it is now condemned; ſuch men forget that it is theory no longer: it is now fact and hiſtory; the experiment was made; we have ſeen the reſult; it failed totally and completely; in the name of common ſenſe, let us, as farmers, regard experience only; and when theſe eternal theoriſts ſtill recur to new viſions of their heated brains, let us reply, *the thing is tried; that method of drilling has been experimented and found good for nothing; the crop did not anſwer*; the principles of farming are the principles of government; when you have experiment for your guide, will you reſort to theory? When experiment has damned half a dozen theories from the ſame quarter, will you ſtill liſten to new fancies, and go to work again, becauſe the ſame men tell you they have new imaginations for your employment? The leading concluſion, deducible from the French experiment, and written in characters, which he that runs may read, is this, IF PERSONS ARE REPRESENTED, PROPERTY IS DESTROYED. We know then what to think of the propoſals for reform *hitherto made* in this kingdom.

* The firſt leaders in the Revolution ſaid this, and they now feel the conſequence. Neckar, who gave the *double tiers*, baniſhed with the loſs of an hundred thouſand pounds; Siéyès who ſaid *le tiers eſt tout* in diſgrace; and Barnave, who aſked if the firſt blood ſpilled was ſo pure, in a dungeon; *le beau jour* of Bailly ſhines at preſent in a garret at London; La Fayette feels

in

have given the power from their hands, by which alone others are prevented from puſhing matters a little further; and that theſe again are impelled by a third ſet, who drive at the Rights of Man, and pulling down all that exiſts at preſent, with the temple of Dagon, by the Sampſon of the mob. However reſpectable, well-meaning, but wrong-headed, men may be for their motives, let it not be imagined for a moment that there is any thing reſpectable in the levellers, your fellows of the Rights of Man, whoſe principles are not a jot better than thoſe of highwaymen and houſe-breakers; for the object of both is *equalizing property*.

Mr. Wyvil, in his late pamphlet, talks of *temperate reformation*, and of *pointing the zeal of the people to a moderate correction of grievances*, (p. 89.) As if it was poſſible, after rouſing, by inflammatory publications, the mobiſh ſpirit, that you could draw the line of *moderation*, beyond which the populace ſhould not paſs! You want to correct grievances by means of *the people*; who, with power to effect the purpoſe, muſt have power to do much more. If they have that power, will they uſe it? Go to Paris for the anſwer.

in the priſon of Wezel, that inſurrection is not *la plus ſaint des devoirs*; and had Mirabeau been now alive, his head would have been on a pike. See theſe changes admirably touched in various paſſages of *La Derniere Tableau de Paris*, par M. Peltier.

But

But that ſomething more than temperate and moderate reform is really the object, we have an undoubted proof, in a work publiſhed the other day, by one of the heads of the reforming party, who praiſes the French Revolution as not the *reformation* of a government, but its *utter deſtruction* (its *diſſolution*, in the author's own words); and erecting in its room THAT which proved, ſo ſoon after the author dated his letter, and before he publiſhed it, a MONSTER; and is now the bloodieſt and moſt deteſtable tyranny that has blotted the annals of modern Europe.

Power in the hands *of the people*, by means of perſonal repreſentation, has ruined France. And the queſtion in England is, whether the farmers and land proprietors ſhall preſerve their property ſecure, by one and all conſidering the ſyſtem with the horror it merits; or ſhall, by doubt and heſitation, unite with the enemies of public peace, and hazard all that we poſſeſs at preſent.

I cannot well underſtand on what principles republicans and friends of liberty, can now give their approbation to this eventful Revolution. To be conſiſtent with their own doctrines, they ought to hold the actors, on the theatre of French affairs, as the moſt fatal enemies to human liberty

* Major Cartwright.

the world has ever ſeen: they have not only ſhewn mankind in a new and hideous aſpect of ingratitude, paſt all example, but they have proved that liberty, in the abſtract and in theory, is unfit for the maſs of mankind, and even pernicious to their intereſts, and the intereſt of practical freedom. They have given a leſſon of tyranny to all the governments of the world; they have given a panegyric on the perpetuity of political darkneſs, and on the propagation of political ignorance.

Perſonal repreſentation in cities muſt be apt to fall into the hands of a few of the moſt daring, reſtleſs, and profligate of the mob: of this, we have an inſtance, ſtrangely remarkable, in the caſe of Paris; in that city there are about 150,000 voters, yet the number who have been brought to poll have varied from 9000 to 12000; it is, therefore, evident that the maſs of the inhabitants, finding they could not vote freely and in ſafety, would not vote at all. What a ſatire is this on the univerſal ſuffrage of the mob, who regulate the right of their neighbours voting, as they diſtribute juſtice—by the pike! "Materials fit for all the purpoſes of government," ſays Paine, "may be found in every town." He certainly means the pike, for that is the chief material in the new ſyſtem.

"*It is well known,*" ſays the deputation of Finiſtere, at the bar of the Convention, "*that the ſections of Paris are held by at moſt fifty individuals, to whom all cede with a facility perfectly incredible; aſtoniſhed at ſuch a general deſertion, we have been careful to enquire the cauſe, and have been aſſured, that the only reaſon is, that none had the power of freely expreſſing their opinion without running the greateſt danger: We are ſhocked to think of ſuch a popular deſpotiſm**. If perſonal repreſentation has, in the ſhort period of four years, given the government of France into the hands of the mob—with two legiſlative bodies in ſucceſſion moſt compleatly devoid of property; and, if the conſequence has been the deſtruction of property, and delivery of its poſſeſſors, to be butchered or baniſhed, we are ſurely juſtified in aſſerting that THE EXPERIMENT OF PERSONAL REPRESENTATION HAS BEEN MADE AND TOTALLY FAILED †.

The

* Monit. Dec. 26.

† The Jacobins boaſt the government of America, too ſoon to have experiment for their ſupport, all countries fully ſettled muſt have a numerous and indigent poor: America with immenſe deſarts of fertile land at command, has no indigent poor to govern: ſhe is, therefore, exempt from the great difficulty of all government—but the time will come when ſhe is no longer free from its preſſure—when ſhe has a numerous and indigent poor, poiſoned or enlightened by a licentious preſs, it will then be found whether her ſyſtem is ſo perfect as ſome pre-

tend.

II.

The Rights of Man were the next pillar of the French ſyſtem, and proved, in this eventful experiment, as viſionary and miſchievous as perſonal repreſentation. The conſtitution was built on a declaration of theſe rights; and, as if every para-

tend. "The truth is," ſays Dr. Wilſon, "that in our governments the ſupreme, abſolute, and uncontroulable power remains in the people, as our conſtitutions are ſuperior to our legiſlature; ſo the people are ſuperior to our conſtitutions. Indeed, the ſuperiority in this laſt inſtance is much greater; for the people poſſeſs over our conſtitutions, controul in act as well as in right," *Commentaries on the American Conſtitutions.* So able a writer, doubtleſs, is not miſtaken in this; but if the fact is true, anarchy and confuſion, and the concomitant deſtruction of property, will inevitably be the fate of that country, when indigence is found in the maſs of her people. If they are in truth paramount, they will paſs laws for their own relief, and how is that to be effected without attacking properties that will not want the epithets of unneceſſary, luxurious, or ariſtocratic, for a pretence. To ſuppoſe that the mob will poſſeſs the ſovereign authority *in act* as well as in right, and remain hungry, is a farce—and worthy only of the theories with which we have been muſed; and who has inſtructed us clearly in the importance of ſuch a character, as General Waſhington keeping heterogeneous parts to one common center.

graph of the code had been formed only to be broken, practice has torn the whole into fritters, or trampled it under feet, with a contempt it never experienced in any other country. So that a man would go much readier to Conſtantinople than to Paris, for the exerciſe. Its commentator calls out for anſwers to his performance.—The French Revolution is an anſwer round and complete; there is not a page it does not reply to—there is not a poſition it does not damn: and the author has the daily mortification to ſee his marvellous efforts ſurpaſſed by his colleagues in the legiſlative banditti, who arrive at the ſame end by a ſhorter road; by engraving the Rights of Man, with poniards, dipt in the beſt blood in France.

When that prince of incendiaries, reviewing a train of his projects, aſks, with an air of triumph, after each, *would not this be a good thing? This ſurely would be a good thing!* In like manner, take the French declaration of the Rights of Man, and there is hardly an article to be found, to which the ſame writer and an hundred others, would not annex the ſame queſtion, *is not this good? Can you deny this?* But concentrating the rays of right into one focus, and giving it in a declaration to the people as the impreſcriptible right of man—the right of reſiſtance againſt oppreſſion became the

power

power to oppreſs; the right to liberty crammed every priſon on ſuſpicion; the right to ſecurity fixed it at the point of the pike; the right to property was the ſignal of plunder; and the right to life became the power to cut throats. ARE THESE GOOD THINGS? If declarations of right and governments, founded on them are really good, the reſult muſt be good alſo. But theſe are the good things in practice, that flow in a direct line from the good things of French theory.

The madneſs of transferring ſuch rights to Britain belongs to the mechanics and labourers at Stockport *,—who, complaining that the uſeful ſcience of politics is *neglected*, aſſemble to diffuſe it; they reſolve that all men are born equal in their rights, that the ſovereignty of every nation ought to be inveſted in the people as their birth-right; who have the chief right to poſſeſs all that labour produces: and it is a very curious circumſtance in theſe reſolutions, that though they reſolve that the liberty of the preſs ought to be inviolable, yet do they not give one atom of a reſolution, that any man has a right to property, except the right of the mechanic and the labourer to all that labour produces. Theſe are reſolutions perfectly congenial

* Manchester Herald, Sept. 1.

in their purview, to that degree of ſecurity to property which the revolution produced in France. Theſe labourers and mechanics may tell us that *they deteſt riots*; but as they are ſo deep in the *ſcience* of politics, they ought to know that their object and their reſolutions tend pointedly and directly to the utter ruin and deſtruction of all government, peace, and ſecurity of either life or property. So alſo in the reſolutions of a ſimilar ſociety at Derby, * they ſpeak of *temperate and honeſt diſcuſſions*, and call on other ſocieties to act with *unanimity and firmneſs, until the people be too wiſe to be impoſed upon; and their influence in the government be commenſurate with their dignity and importance.* Can any perſon, warm from the recital of the horrors committed by the "ſwiniſh multitude" in France—by the moſt enlightened of all the mobs of France—who have moſt ſtudied the *ſcience of politics*, and moſt frequented ſocieties ſimilar to theſe—can any man of property, acquainted with theſe abominations—read ſuch reſolution without indignation? *Temperate and honeſt diſcuſſions!* Why the diſcuſſions of the Jacobins were doubtleſs once temperate; their honeſty is another queſtion. But let us not be deceived by ſmooth words at the outſet. Theſe men demand THAT which they cannot have without

* Manchester Herald, Aug. 18.

poſſeſſing

poſſeſſing the power of ſeizing our property and cutting our throats—they aſſociate and combine, in order to attain their end. To ſuppreſs at once, by vigorous and deciſive meaſures, ſuch hot-beds of ſedition and plunder, is the firſt duty of parliament; reſolutions leſs offenſive than theſe began the buſineſs in France; we have ſeen the event. *Temperate reſolutions* were the theory; plunder, rapine, and murder the practice.

Give us our rights, is an expreſſion which has been uſed with ſingular emphaſis; the reply once proper, was an abſtract reaſoning on the nature of thoſe rights: we have now ſomething much ſurer to direct our judgments; and can anſwer with ſtrict reference to the facts that govern the queſtion, "you have your rights; you are in poſſeſſion of every right that is conſiſtent with ſafety to the life and property of others;—to give you more will endanger both,—to give you *much* more will infallibly deſtroy them, and eventually yourſelves. You have, therefore, ALL your rights, for you have all that are conſiſtent with your happineſs; and thoſe who aſſociate to gain more, ſeek, by means which they know to be the high road to confuſion, to ſeize what is NOT their right, at the expence of crimes ſimilar to thoſe that have deſtroyed the firſt kingdom of the world.

It is common to hear it aſſerted in France, that the ruin of the conſtitution, eſtabliſhed on the Rights of Man, was owing only to the *perfidy* of the court, and not to thoſe *Rights*, which is a wretched ſophiſtry; theſe men do not perceive that that perfidy was a part of the conſtitution which include a court; if courts can be perfidious, you are to ſuppoſe they will be ſo; and if you have not ſo provided as to turn that perfidy to the benefit of the people, you confeſs at once that your conſtitution is viſionary, and if you muſt deſtroy it, THE EXPERIMENT FAILED. The ſecond experiment, which is now in execution, fails equally; for there is no proviſion whatever to ſecure to the repreſentatives of the people the obedience of the people; and we accordingly find, that all is anarchy, on their own jacobin authority; in the firſt experiment there was no ſecurity againſt the perfidy of a court; and in the ſecond, none againſt the violence of the people; to get rid of one evil they plunge into another, till, in the accumulation of oppoſite miſchiefs, there is no better relief than Marat's grand ſpecific of cutting off 150,000 heads. In this argument, I take the jacobin ground of ſuppoſing the court perfidious; which is an impudent lye, for a priſoner, deprived of his rights, cannot be perfidious.

Perhaps it will be ſaid the preſent experiment is not finiſhed, and that when a better executive power

power is eſtabliſhed, things will go well; but this is abſolutely inadmiſſible; for the whole force and colour of Jacobin argument in England is, that the legiſlative power is too weak, and the executive too ſtrong; and that the remedy of this evil is to let the Commons be really the repreſentative of the people: Now this *is* the caſe in France—and what is the evil? Why, preciſely, that the people will not obey the men choſen by themſelves;—they do not love the Convention enough to have confidence in it; this is an incurable evil, which no modification of the executive can affect; it ſtrikes at the heart of perſonal repreſentation—the mob elects, and the mob does not know how to chuſe, and ſtill leſs to obey.

III.

As to equality, the laſt ſupport of the French ſyſtem, it is too farſical and ridiculous to merit a ſerious obſervation,—it is worthy only of Monſieur *Egalité!* who has waſted three hundred thouſand pounds a year, in order to ſtand on record the firſt fool in Europe, and to give the better part of his countrymen occaſion to call that aſſumption great

impudence; for he who was below all, could be *equal* to none. A genius, who ſacrificed the firſt property of any ſubject in Europe, and the name of Bourbon, to become the ſubject of debate in an aſſembly of taylors, ſtay-makers, barbers and butchers, whether he ſhould not be baniſhed from that country which he had diſgraced by his crimes!

The equal right of all citizens to equal laws, was declared in the firſt conſtitution; the new equality of the Convention, therefore, means ſomething more. Equality of right to equal juſtice,—that in the law all are equal;—this equality was decreed by the Conſtituent Aſſembly, and clearly aſcertained to be the law of the land; the new declaration of equality muſt therefore mean ſomething more, or it meant nothing; if equality of rights were only in contemplation, why call the year 1792 the firſt year of equality? the fourth of liberty and firſt of equality? A clearer proof cannot be deſired, that the equality of 1792 was not the equality of 1789; let the writers and ſpeakers who aſſert the term in the two points to mean the ſame thing, reconcile the abſurdity if they are able. To the apprehenſion of common underſtanding, property was glanced at;—that the French populace ſo underſtood

ſtood it, there is abundant proof indeed, for propoſitions were immediately made for the equal diviſion of wealth, and received in a manner that left no doubt of the meaſure being perfectly to their taſte; and theſe propoſitions have been carried into execution much more than commonly admitted in England. The peaſantry paying no taxes, while they force their richer neighbours to pay to the laſt ſhilling, is directly in point?

But the curſe of theſe principles of equality is, that they never can allow tranquility to be the inheritance of a people; ſuppoſing it poſſible for a country, infeſted with ſuch doctrines, to be well governed, ſuch good government will infallibly generate wealth and inequality; and by conſequence the neceſſity of new civil wars and confuſion to reſtore the equality which would for ever tend to variation; thus, under ſuch fine ſpun principles, peace could never inhabit; tranquility would be baniſhed, even by the merits, ſuppoſing there were any, of the ſyſtem; and new arrangements of property would be periodically to make, at the caprice and tyranny of thoſe who, poſſeſſing nothing, would look to confuſion as their ſupport, and to anarchy as their birth-right.

Such

Such have been the three leading principles of the French Revolution; perſonal repreſentation, the rights of man and equality; and the queſtion for us to decide upon (a greater queſtion never was before a nation,) is this: Shall we imitate the example of France, and by tampering with that Conſtitution to which we owe all our proſperity, hazard ſo immenſe a ſtake of happineſs? There are men to be found who demand this, and even ſocieties aſſociated to enforce

Reform.

As the queſtion has been diſcuſſed to ſatiety, the obſervations that follow ſhall be brief:—It is not uncommon to hear the expreſſion of *reſtoring the Conſtitution to its original purity.*—Two words on this purity will not be entirely miſplaced. This is an expreſſion we often meet with in the writings and ſpeeches of men, who apparently are not very intimately acquainted with the ſtate of repreſentation in former periods. It tends ſtrongly to give an idea to the ignorant and unwary, that the conſtitution has declined, and is at preſent in a worſe ſtate for the liberty of the people than it was in former periods; and that the evils now complained of were not to be found in its practice or principles at times

times alluded to. There is no man acquainted with the hiſtory of England who does not know that this is a groſs error, and that the circumſtances now moſt complained of, ſuch as inequality of repreſentation and burgage tenures, took place ages before the Revolution, and were eſtabliſhed before we had any regular conſtitution at all. Let us throw a rapid eye over a few inſtances, which will be ſufficient to ſhew that there never was, even in idea, ſuch a principle as equal repreſentation, and that as to the practice, no reformer has yet been able to ſhew its exiſtence.

Camden, who wrote in Queen Elizabeth's reign, ſpeaking of Dunwich, ſays, *that it lies in ſolitude and deſolation.* Orford, he ſays, was *once* populous. At Eye, he finds nothing but the *rubbiſh* of an old monaſtery, and the *ruins* of a caſtle. He ſays of Caſtle-Riſing, *it is ruinated, and as it were expiring for age.* Yet this place had its charter to ſend members the laſt year of Philip and Mary; and Eye, the 13th of Elizabeth. This looks very little like any intention to give places of conſequence only that privilege. Camelford, in Cornwall, he ſays, *is a little village.* Leſtwithiel *is a little town, and not at all populous.* St. Germains, he calls *a ſmall village of nothing but fiſhermen's huts,* yet this charter was no older than Elizabeth.

I have no time, at preſent, to ſearch for the ſtate of many boroughs in a former age, but theſe inſtances are ſufficient to ſhew, not only that the conſtitution ſtood in this reſpect on as rotten a foundation in the reign of Elizabeth, as at preſent, but that charters for ſending members to the Houſe of Commons were actually granted to places of no kind of conſideration. To what period then are we to look for that ideal perfection in this part of the conſtitution, which is not to be found in it at preſent?

Hiſtorians are agreed in the Parliament of 1265, ſummoned by a uſurper, being the origin of the Houſe of Commons: ‡ the Earl of Leiceſter ordered the attendance of repreſentatives, from ſuch places only as he thought proper, that is, from ſuch as were known to be in his intereſt; and it is now unknown whether the knights of ſhires were not elected by the ſheriffs. The legal monarchs followed this example, and gave the power of election to whatever towns they thought proper, and ordered, in many caſes, in whom the right

‡ I know it has been very boldly aſſerted, that ſome boroughs, particularly St. Alban's, ſent members in the reign of King John—but it is a *ſuppoſition*, and founded on the implication of a ſingle word: It is a groſs error; Mr. Hume's account may be ſafely relied on. As to the old Parliaments, they were all ariſtocratical.

right of election ſhould reſide. What reforming writer has preſumed to ſhew a period in the number of centuries that have elapſed ſince, in which there ever exiſted, for one moment, an *equal* or a *perſonal* repreſentation of the people? What then but empty factious nonſenſe is meant by the original purity of that ſyſtem which was gradually formed in times of ſtorm or deſpotiſm; and never deſerved the name of ſettled freedom till the Revolution. I ſpeak only of facts; as to the *principles* of the Conſtitution before that great æra, they are juſt what every writer pleaſes to call them; to term them *pure*, is *gratis dictum*; they may be pious or beautiful, or whatever the theory pleaſes; it is not theory we demand, but PRACTICE.

The fact is, that the preſent conſtitution of England was gradually extorted, ſword in hand, from feudal ſovereigns deriving *their* rights from the ſword of a conqueror: Nobly extorted; but deriving from no other right. It is now legally eſtabliſhed, and has the ſanction of ages to give it the veneration that, with wiſe men, belongs to antient eſtabliſhments; and thoſe perſons who demand the conſtitution of ſome preceding age, (which they ought to demand, when they ſpeak of *purity*, greater than that of the preſent age) as a

ſyſtem

ſyſtem better than what we enjoy, are bound to name the period, when the liberty of the ſubject was in theory better defined, or in practice better protected.

There is indeed a period to which our reformers allude with ſingular pleaſure, and which is in their contemplation oftener than they name it;—the republic in the middle of the laſt century; there was the *purity* admired by ſo many; a period, that bore ſome reſemblance to the preſent in France. The parliament which met in 1640, are termed by a female hiſtorian, "Patriots, whoſe number, virtues, and abilities, were greater than had ever been convened in any age or country." If ſuch men were guilty of enormities and tyranny, it muſt ariſe from the ſituation, and not from the peculiar ſtructure of their boſoms. Two words will diſpatch their actions: they paſſed a triennial bill, and ſat themſelves 13 years. They quarrelled with the King for levying 200,000l. a year illegally, and in five years they raiſed, by their own ſingle authority, FORTY MILLIONS, fully equal to one hundred millions at preſent.—They were accuſed by one of their own party of dividing 300,000l. among their own members—An accuſation highly probable, when it is upon record, that in the aſſeſſments of thoſe infinite burthens they

they laid on the people, their own members were exempted, ſo as to be taxed only by one another—They inſtituted country committees, with power to fine, ſequeſter, impriſon, and corporally puniſh without appeal, and without law—They put an imprimatur on the preſs—and they aboliſhed the trial by jury againſt their own accuſations—They preſſed men into their armies, and then paſſed ordinances for puniſhing them if they ran away—The King and Parliament never yet clapped an excife on BREAD, fleſh, and every conſumable commodity; but the Parliament alone did it without compunction. If this manual of tyranny is good, they would do wiſely to repeat it. The whole ended, as might have been foreſeen, in a pure deſpotiſm, as the preſent copy of it will do in France.

There cannot be a more ſerious or a more awful ſubject for Parliament to enter upon, than that of any *alterations* in the conſtitution: that there could not be a better one, nobody will aſſert; it may be poſſible, that a nation might enjoy the ſame bleſſings at a leſs expence; but to give us a *change* under the name of an *improvement*, is a dangerous experiment. What is called a real repreſentation of the people (that is, an equal repreſentation) and biennial Parliaments, would certainly be a *great* change; property now has the power

power of this realm; and under ſuch a change, population would have the power; in ſome governments of America this is the caſe; but America has no indigent poor, or at leaſt very few, ariſing from plenty of land; thus America is no example applicable to us. We ſee very exactly in France, what is an indigent poor poſſeſſed of power. So great a change as taking the government of the kingdom from property, and giving it to population, is not *reſtoring* principles of purity, but eſtabliſhing *new* ones, an abſolutely untried experiment any where but in France. If it is once admitted that property ought to poſſeſs the power, it is of very litttle conſequence whether the election is by burgage tenures or any other mode, as the men of the greateſt property will find themſelves in the houſe; and as to the Crown, Orford and Harwich ſhew that it is as likely to loſe a borough as to gain one. The queſtion, however, is of ſuch importance, that reaſoning ought not to be admitted; the FACT is, that property poſſeſſes the preponderancy of power at preſent in the Houſe of Commons; the changes propoſed, all tend to remove it from property to population; this is not a *reſtoration*, but an abſolute *novelty*.

There are men pretending to be moderate, who argue for, and are ready to declare their approbation

tion of the Engliſh Conſtitution, as fixed in King, Lords, and Commons, conſidering the Commons as the repreſentatives *of the people*; and they contend that as the Commons do purport to be a repreſentation of the people, they wiſh for no other alteration in the government than to make that Houſe *really* that which it purports to be. This is the moſt rational ground that any reformer can take, becauſe here is a ſemblance of propriety. Very few words will be neceſſary to ſhew *from facts* that it is only a ſemblance.

I contend in reply, that it is mere theory to ſuppoſe that the Houſe of Commons purports to be the repreſentatives of the people, if by repreſentation is meant *choice*. Being once choſen by the few, they repreſent the many. They *purport* to be nothing more than what they *are:* and they are nothing more than this — men ſitting in a ſenate, and forming a third branch of the legiſlature, choſen by certain bodies, who by the conſtitution have the privilege of electing them. They may be accurately deſcribed without uſing the word, or referring to the idea of repreſentation. To call them the repreſentatives of the people, is a very inaccurate mode of expreſſion; they ought never to be called by any other name than the Houſe of Commons, to diſtinguiſhed them from the Houſe of Lords. If they were *really* the repreſentatives of *the people*, they might

in theory be good, or better; but they would be ſomething elſe than what *they are*, and conſequently different from that which has rendered us a great, a free, and a happy nation.

But there is not the leaſt reaſon to think that they were ever deemed the repreſentatives of the people; certainly not the Knights for the 40s. qualification of electors, the value of money conſidered, was nearer 40l. of preſent money. The notion of repreſentation and delegation of rights and privileges from the electors, has vitiated and turned to confuſion ſo many ideas on the ſubject, becauſe writers and parliaments themſelves, to ſuit the purpoſes of a moment, have thought it for their intereſt to be eſteemed ſomething different from what they really are. The electors of members of parliament do not delegate powers, nor entruſt privileges, if, by delegation, is meant the transfer of ſomething poſſeſſed by thoſe who depute; for the electors have neither thoſe powers nor thoſe privileges, and therefore cannot delegate them. But the members when elected, and in combination with the other branches of the legiſlature, aſſume, and poſſeſs, and give themſelves ſuch powers and privileges, which thoſe did not poſſeſs who ſent them. Hence, then, the ſeptennial act was juſt as conſtitutional as the biennial.

But, on the other hand, ſuppoſe a nation in any period of confuſion or anarchy, or all conſtituted powers, ſhould, by univerſal conſent and ſuffrage, elect a convention or parliament, for the purpoſe of declaring what in future ſhall be the *National Will*; here you have palpably all the ideas of repreſentation realized, and ſuch deputies ought to ſpeak the direct voice of the people, but ſuch a republic (for it could be nothing elſe,) is a government as diſtinct from that of England as Algiers is; and our Houſe of Commons has not the ſmalleſt reſemblance with ſuch an aſſembly in its origin, its progreſs, or its functions. It is not neceſſary to characteriſe ſuch a government, the caſe of France is directly in point.

If the Houſe of Commons were ſuch repreſentatives, and renewed in ſhort parliaments, they would be guided by the paſſions, folly, and madneſs of the people; we ſee in France what that leads to: at preſent they are guided by their own wiſdom. *But they are corrupt and bribed.* If they are bribed in order to act wiſely, it is an argument directly againſt you, and tends to prove that there is ſomething on the verge of danger in all numerous aſſemblies, which, if not controuled by prerogative or influence, would hazard the public peace. We know, on experience, that they do act wiſely, for nothing but a wiſe government can make a happy

people. If the nature of ſuch an aſſembly demands to be corrupted, in order to purſue the public good, who but a viſionary can wiſh to remove corruption? Government would certainly have been carried on cheaper if honeſty alone had induced our Houſe of Commons to act as it is ſaid corruption has induced them; but if the vices of mankind can, by a well-poiſed conſtitution, be made to contribute to their good government, would it not be inſanity to change the ſyſtem, and imitate the French, who depend only on their virtues?

Examine the Houſe of Commons in whatever light you will, and it will be found to poſſeſs in the power of the purſe ſo enormous an authority, that the other branches of the legiſlature are abſolutely at its mercy: What prevents it from ſwallowing them up? Is it good to prevent it? Is it neceſſary even for the liberty of the people? If it is neceſſary, how beſt done? Would the beſt way of effecting it be popular repreſentation and ſhort parliaments, a ſyſtem in which all corruption, or even influence, would be impoſſible? The obvious reply finiſhes the chain of reaſoning from fact, and proves the utter abſurdity of ſuch propoſitions. But grant for a moment the expedience of the experiment, and ſuppoſe that you have ſuch a Houſe of Commons, on what will you then depend? On their moderation and virtue: but this moderation

and

and virtue have not been tried. If the theory of what moderation may do, and the ſpeculation of what virtue may effect, are as juſt grounds to build on as fact and experiment; in ſuch caſe I am ready to agree, that we may, without impropriety, exchange the poſitive poſſeſſion of what we enjoy at preſent, for the hope and expectation of ſomething better; and to fix here, you have only to prove that theory is as ſatisfactory as practice. To which fine enquiry I leave you as one fairly on a par with the philoſophy of France.

Still the advocates for a reform return to the charge, and aſſert, that Parliament, as elected at preſent, does not ſpeak the will of the people, and that a Houſe of Commons ought to ſpeak that will. The argument is a good one for thoſe who relliſh theory. But I contend on the contrary line of fact, that the proſperity and happineſs we have enjoyed for a century, and never ſo great as at preſent, is owing preciſely to the Houſe of Commons NOT ſpeaking the will of the people; and I am founded in the fact ſo notorious to all the world, that ſuch proſperity has grown to its preſent height under the influence of a Houſe elected not by perſons, but by property: If a parliament ſpeaking therefore the voice *not of the people*, has made us what we are, and if National Aſſemblies ſpeaking the voice of the people, has brought France to her preſent ſituation, I have a double experiment to

ſupport me in the aſſertion, that reforming or changing the conſtitution of our Houſe of Commons, ſo as to make it ſpeak ſome new voice, untried in this kingdom, would be a procedure on theory, and worthy of theoriſts only.

If corruption and influence have given a century of happineſs to this kingdom, and if purity and patriotiſm can in four years ſo completely ruin an empire, as they have ruined our neighbour, I beg for one that the *vices* of England may govern me, and by no means the *virtues* of France; the vices of our government have wealth, eaſe, and proſperity in their train; the virtues of theirs operating by equal repreſentation, biennial elections, and uncorrupt majorities, have brought with them bloodſhed, anarchy, and ruin. The contraſt carries deciſion in the front.

A word, however, might be ſaid on the point of perſonal repreſentation rendering the real will of the people ſupreme. The futility of the idea is demonſtrated in the conduct of the Aſſemblies ſo choſen in France; their firſt merit on Jacobin principles is that of ſpeaking the ſovereign will of the people, by which expreſſion is always underſtood *the majority*: But ſo truly abominable is this ſyſtem of government, that there has not been a ſingle inſtance of great and marked importance, in which

which the minority, and commonly a very ſmall minority, has not, by means of terror, carried all before them. The Conſtituent Aſſembly acted, from the beginning, in direct defiance of their cahiers, which were the inſtructions given them by their conſtituents; and they did this with a mob raging at their doors, in their gallery, and even on their benches and in the chair of their preſident. The National Aſſembly acted equally under the dominion of the pikes of Paris, witneſs that memorable vote conſecrated to eternal infamy, when 280 voices having driven, by menaces and blood, and maſſacre, the majority to abſence or ſilence, dethroned the King, and aboliſhed the conſtitution, which all France had ſworn to live and die with. The Convention, which has aſſembled ſince, have exhibited the ſame ſpectacle, have been inceſſantly bullied by the mob in the galleries, have voted with a pike at their throats, and exiſted in the hourly expectation of being allowed to exiſt no longer. Such is perſonal repreſentation; ſuch is the ſovereign will of a mob; ſuch is the majeſty of the people; ſuch is liberty, when founded on Equality and Rights of Man! Repreſentation deſtroys itſelf; and generates, with infallible certainty, an oligarchy of mobbiſh demagogues, till, of all other voices, that leaſt heard is the real will of the people: 280 voices declare the will of 745 in the legiſlature; and 11,000 voices in Paris

are the organ of 150,000 voters!!! Bad as you may make rotten boroughs, are they as bad as this?

The abſolute nonſenſe of all that Paine ſays on the diſtinct natures of a conſtitution and a government, applied not to a fœderation of independent republics as America, but confounded as he confounds it with the new conſtitution of France, was glorioufly exemplified in the National Aſſembly, (which was the *government*) deſtroying the Conſtitution; demanding of the people, (that is of anarchy) to make a new one. Here the fact clearly is, *that an equal repreſentation ſitting in one houſe, and in a great city, had the power to deſtroy a conſtitution eſtabliſhed and ſworn to by all France*; and the concluſion that let the next conſtitution be what it may, it will be equally in the power of the government of the day aſſembling at Paris, to deſtroy that alſo.

An argument I have heard much urged in this—that ſomething ſhould be granted to moderate men, in order to ſeparate them from the *republican* party. It is urged that the obſtinacy of the legiſlature granting nothing, drives moderate men to aſſociate with others not equally moderate in their views; but if a temperate reform was to be effected or even commenced by the Legiſlature, all who

are at preſent with reaſon diſcontented, would be detached from the reformers, and the violent party would ſink for want of notice.

In replying to this common objection, I do not mean to aſſert, that all innovation ſhould always be rejected; I would only bring to the recollection of moderate men, certain circumſtances which it is fair to weigh.

The clubs, aſſociations, and ſocieties, who aſſemble with views of enforcing reformation, on certain plans projected by various writers, ſome moderate, ſome violent, have publiſhed repeatedly to the world the principles on which they would found the national freedom, and the multifarious changes they would make in the conſtitution; theſe very generally go to great lengths. While imaginations are heated by the example of France; while the moſt unlimited panegyric is profuſely laviſhed on the Revolution; while the demands made are of a nature that threaten the entire overthrow of our government; while thoſe Rights of Man, which have deluged France in blood, are openly profeſſed as leading principles in the improvements called for here, it may ſurely be admitted in candour, as a fair reply to the moderate—That to give a little, when a great deal is demanded, does not ſeem the way to quiet clamour;

clamour; and when, by a thouſand publications and reſolutions, it is declared, that PERSONAL REPRESENTATION is the panacea for all our evils, (though under a hundred various names,) and demanded even with threats and menaces, it muſt be palpable to every conſiderate man, that ſmall conceſſions to ſatisfy the moderate would be loſt in the agitation of the moment—deſpiſed as the conceſſions of timidity; wreſted from fear not granted by conviction. They would be made a vantage ground for new demands; and clamour, inſtead of being ſilenced, would vociferate with renewed vigour.

All demands, therefore, that come under the theory or practice of perſonal repreſentation, ſhould be reſiſted on principle with firmneſs, and a determined reſolution never to take that firſt ſtep to anarchy, confuſion, bloodſhed, and Jacobiniſm, which, in one word, ſums up all that is atrocious in political depravity. This ought to be conſidered as the only line of demarcation clearly defined, that ſeparates moderation of ſentiments from inſanity of innovation.

"When the right," ſays Paine, "to make a conſtitution is eſtabliſhed in a nation, there is no fear that it will be employed to its own injury. A nation can have no intereſt in being wrong." But here,

here, as in every page of his work, the practice of France is the reply to the theory of his ſedition. That kingdom *eſtabliſhed* ſuch right; and what was the conſequence? Why it proved no more than the right to cut her own throat. It was employed to much more than her injury, for it was employed to her utter deſtruction. That a nation can have no intereſt in being wrong is a trueiſm; but in the full teeth of her own intereſt, ſhe choſe never to be right. What is the force and worth of ſuch a writer's eternal ſtrings of aſſertion, when brought to the teſt of French experiment!

The principle of our conſtitution is the repreſentation of property; imperfectly in theory, but efficiently in practice; by means of apparent defects, but which, perhaps, are diſguiſed merits; the great maſs of property, both landed, monied, and commercial, finds itſelf repreſented; and that the evils of ſuch repreſentation are trivial, will appear from the eaſe, happineſs, and ſecurity of all the lower claſſes, hence poſſibly virtual repreſentation takes place, even where the real ſeems moſt remote.

If virtual repreſentation is good, would not real repreſentation be better?—No, replies experiment; it has been tried in France, and failed entirely; real perſonal repreſentation is not a people

well governed, but the government of the people; that is to ſay, anarchy and ruin. If parliament acts from the immediate impulſe of the people, and it can act no otherwiſe with perſonal repreſentation, the wiſdom of the community is governed by the folly of it. While experience gives the living an energic ſanction to this principle, in the cleareſt and moſt unqueſtioned proſperity that any nation ever yet enjoyed, would it not be inſanity to riſk this fair inheritance, this rich poſſeſſion, on the crude deductions of new theories; on ſuppoſitious improvement; ideal benefits; and ſpeculative reformation. Yet this is pleaded for by the advocates for Rights of Man. On grounds of ſuch pure theory, a prudent farmer would not change the culture of a turnep field; yet theſe reformers, on no better foundation, call for alterations in a government that has given proſperity to a great empire.

Nor let us forget that theſe men have been equal friends to the French Revolution from the beginning, and they are ſteadily ſo at this moment; under the Conſtituent Aſſembly they approved, and publiſhed panegyrics on the annihilation of orders: under the next aſſembly they rejoiced at the demolition of royalty; and under the Convention all the horrors we have ſeen are inſufficient to remove their approbation. Does not this conduct prove clearly, that when theſe politicians tell us they

they mean and wiſh only moderate and temperate reform, they inſult our underſtandings? If they really deſired any thing ſhort of the total overthrow of our government, would they continue to enliſt, to ſpeak, and to write, under Jacobin banners? Would they exalt the deſtruction of the old government of France, as the greateſt event of hiſtory? Would they glory in French events, effected as they have been by proſcriptions and maſſacre? You want only temperate reform?—I will tell you what you want by the company you keep—if you are a party in aſſociations, you want THAT for which thoſe aſſociations combine:—if you call for perſonal repreſentation, you call for THAT which perſonal repreſentation has given to France;—if you demand a popular Aſſembly, ſubjected to popular phrenzy, you demand the effects which ſuch an Aſſembly produced with our neighbours. You would go only certain lengths—but you herd with thoſe, and give them your countenance who you know would puſh events much further: have we not, therefore, reaſon for judging directly from your actions, that you *mean* more than you think political to *avow*.

It is curious to remark the conduct of certain men, calling themſelves moderate, who make the tour of reforming ſocieties, but quit them when they *go too far*. There are ſuch now clamorous

amongſt the *Friends of the People*, who have ſtruck their names out of the *Conſtitutional Society*, as they found their views too bold: this is the exact miniature of a Revolution; the firſt inſtigators want, perhaps, a moderate reform of abuſes, and when their companions drive at more, they ſeparate; but ſuch companions do not ſtop their purſuit for want of moderate men, who, by their countenance, brought the ill-deſigning into conſequence, and it is then no longer in their power to ſuppreſs them. Thus the *Conſtitutional Society*, though quitted by the reſpectable, were not therefore ſilent, but at the bar of the Convention of France hail the coming Convention of England: theſe men will do the ſame with the *friends of the people:* when they have nurſed up miſchievous men into a ſociety of importance, they will be driven out if they refuſe to go all lengths, and will find that the only reſult of their moderate views has been to promote and bring into efficacy the immoderate deſigns of thoſe who think our Conſtitution the temple of Dagon, and that to level it in the duſt is a duty, in order that out of its ruins may ariſe the "heavenly form" and "delightful viſion" of a French Convention. What is the concluſion? —That the firſt lines of diſcontent are in fact the moſt dangerous; that moderate reform, or any reform at all, *on principle*, is a ſure ſtep to all that

followed

followed reform in France; jacobiniſm, anarchy, and blood.

If any attempts, at ſo perilous a ſeaſon, to reform the conſtitution, muſt be attended with ſuch unqueſtionable danger, reaſoning as we may juſtly do on the experiment of France; it will follow, that EVERY INTEREST in this kingdom is bound to reſiſt, with the utmoſt ſolicitude, ſuch miſchievous projects, the execution of which, amongſt our neighbours, has deluged a great kingdom with univerſal ruin.

THE LANDED INTEREST is immediately and moſt eſſentially concerned; for the poiſon of equality in principle and in French practice tends directly to their ruin: the fate of landlords in France is too well known to want repetition; their eſtates ſeized; their chateaus plundered and burnt; their wives and daughters violated; and themſelves either murdered or driven into exile; and this to an almoſt incredible extent. I have ſeen details which ſhew, that the landed property of more than half the kingdom has changed hands. The farmers have not much more to boaſt of, for they have paid dearly for their exemption from tythes in the violent attacks made on the ſize of farms and conſequent diviſion; the hard ſilver which, under the *old* government, was the price

of

of their products, is become paper depreciated to half its value under the *new*; and even this wretched ſubſtitute they are not allowed to receive at a fair market; their treatment in this reſpect has been already detailed: out-voted, and conſequently cheated in taxation: at market plundered by the mob; at home plundered by the military. Are theſe facts to make our Engliſh yeomenry and farmers wiſh to try their ſkill at mending the conſtitution? Are they calculated to give us any reſpect for clubs and ſocieties, whoſe object is the reform of that conſtitution which has rendered our ſituation directly the reverſe of France? Do ſuch facts give us reaſon to love the men who want to convert your plough-ſhares into pikes, and your coulters into daggers? Who would recommend you to change your ſickles for the ſabres of a company of patriot contractors? Gentlemen who have ſhewn themſelves exceedingly adroit in cutting down fields of French corn. I wiſh you to make experiments in huſbandry, but do not let them be of this complection: do not let other men, and eſpecially reformers, make experiments on your property, your bread, and your blood; three objects upon which many experiments have been tried in France, and we have ſeen that the ſucceſs has not been ſuch as gives us reaſon to try our hands at the ſame work: for, in one word, their property is gone; for bread they have the

bark

bark of trees; and as to blood, it is the only manure the fields of France have ſeen, from the firſt moment ſhe liſtened to reformers. Is ſhe then to us an example or a warning?

Traders and manufacturers can preſently convert their wealth into money, and fly with it on paper wings wherever property remains ſecure; but the farmer is chained to a ſpot, his property is inveſted in the ſoil he cultivates;—he has no power of movement;—he muſt abide the beating of the ſtorm, be it pitileſs as it may.—To him, therefore, the new fangled doctrines of equality ought to appear in all their native deformity; for they are doctrines that tend directly to his deſtruction; and from whoſe peſtilential influence he cannot, like others, fly.

THE MONIED INTEREST, in moments of convulſion, have ſome advantages from the more portable nature of their wealth, but the warning of France may inſtruct, that nothing can eſcape the depredations flowing from the Rights of Man. Their national debt, amounting to 300 millions, ſterling, has been treated not altogether with the delicacy ſhewn to the public creditors of England, for every ſort of bankruptcy, but a nominal and declared one has been committed; and the intereſt on funds and mortgages paid, has been in aſſig-

nats: if a man ſells ſtock, he receives aſſignats, and though aſſignats are portable, what is their value on the exchange of London, or the Stadthouſe at Amſterdam *?—Of ninety millions ſterling of former currency, eighteen twentieths have diſappeared. The monied men have, therefore, loſt ſtock and caſh; credit has followed; ſo, without funds, credit or caſh, and nothing ſeen in the immenſe vacuity but aſſignats, the monied intereſt of France muſt flouriſh marvellouſly. Is there

* The aſtoniſhing and daily coinage of aſſignats, by the Convention, muſt have effects which they do not ſeem clearly to foreſee; from their readineſs to iſſue paper, it ſhould ſeem that they expect a poſſible continuance of the ſame facility, but in this they will certainly find themſelves deceived. The amount in circulation much exceeds what is known. The number of forgers of falſe aſſignats now in their goals proves this fact; but the great deluge is not by men within their power. The Princes, the Duke of Braunſwick, and all the enemies of France, in every place they came to, left in circulation immenſe quantities: and what is ſtill worſe their own ſucceſſes in Flanders, and on the Rhine, had the ſame effect; no town was taken that was not well provided: though depreciated, this currency made good plunder for ſoldiers, who were hardly at the trouble of plundering in order to procure it. This exceſſive introduction was probably the reaſon for the countrymen abſolutely refuſing to take them. Dans les Belgique, les habitans des campagnes ne veulent pas recevoir d'aſſigats; Ce diſcredit vient de ce que les emigres en ont repandu un multitude de faux. Monit. Dec. 14.

any

any thing in this picture that ſhould make the monied intereſt of England fond of revolutions?

Unite theſe circumſtances with the horrible deficiency of the preſent year's revenue; the expence they are at in hard caſh for purchaſing foreign corn, to prevent their ſtarving; the immenſe efforts they muſt make for the next campaign; the growing habit of the people not to pay taxes; and the univerſal decline of both manufactures and commerce; it muſt then be apparent to every eye that their gaſconading decree of war againſt the conſtitutions of all their neighbours, is an effort of deſpair; ſhould rebellions fail them,—ſhould they miſs the ſafety which Paine beſpoke for them, "when France ſhall be ſurrounded with Revolutions, ſhe will be in peace and ſafety;" they will find internal ruin of every ſort diſſeminating too faſt to be ſupported: The people will find themſelves in a ſituation helpleſs, proportioned to their ſucceſs; for their paper, on the frontier, is not of half the value it bears in the interior of the kingdom. This is their real ſource of weakneſs, and it is abſolutely irremediable; nor will the farmers continue to cultivate the ground for more than the phyſical neceſſaries of their families, if paid only in a currency continually depreciated;—annual famines enſue;—in a word the ſeeds of ruin lie ſcattered ſo thickly that the moſt careleſs atten-

tion muſt recognize them. The nation feeling ſeverely that equality means but equal miſery; and that the Rights of Man produce only the right to be ſtarved—will revolt, and call in, ſhould they not be *too much preſſed from without*, their lawful ſovereign as the beſt and readieſt means of ſafety.

THE COMMERCIAL INTEREST of France has been completely laid in the duſt. Her colonies, by far the greateſt ſource of her trade, have been totally ruined. Equality and the Rights of Man have, to the ſugar of America, been as propitious as to the wheat of France. Aſſignats ſtruck with a palſy all the imports of the kingdom, and her exports, after the deſtruction of St. Domingo, were a handful. The horrible convulſions in the great towns drove the merchants, and maſter manufacturers, with the remnant of their wealth, into other countries, or ſunk them in ruin at home.

We have been told indeed, with ſome degree of confidence, that the French fabrics are not at preſent in ſuch a ſtate of depreſſion as ſome have repreſented. As I have very late intelligence from that kingdom, and on which I can rely, I may venture to aſſert with confidence, and I could confirm it by referring to many repreſentations made to government by the municipalities of the manufacturing towns, that every one wrought from foreign

materials, ſuch as the whole buſineſs of Lyons, and a conſiderable portion of the woollen fabrics are in abſolute ruin; the maſters and undertakers, bankrupts or fled, and the workmen begging in the ſtreets, ſubſiſting by charity, or wandering vagabond banditti—the *brigands* that infect the country, by endeavouring to wring from the peaſantry a portion of that bread they are unable fairly to earn; ſuch is the lot which the new doctrines of equality have produced for Lyons, the ſecond city in France, as well as numerous other places that once were flouriſhing. The governing party in ſuch towns have nothing to give the people but the flattery of equal rights; they ſtarve on equality till the number, in the ſame deſparate ſituation becomes great enough for their *ſacred duty* of inſurrection, then they riſe, knock their governors on the head, and are themſelves *elected* into their places; but this cures the evil ſcarcely for one in a thouſand; the maſs remains ſtill poor; and muſt neceſſarily remain ſo, for ſuch convulſions do not re-eſtabliſh manufactures: Knocking brains out do not ſet looms a going; nor does the exerciſe of the pike in the guts of a mayor and his aldermen bring Italian ſilk to Lyons, or Spaniſh wool to Louviers.

In the manufacturing towns which work up native commodities, the miſery is not equally

great, becauſe there is ſome employment that ſtirs; but let us examine a little more cloſely the nature of this circulation. I am informed, and common ſenſe will tell one it muſt be ſo, that the only motive which induces maſter manufacturers to continue their buſineſs is that of *getting rid of Aſſignats*; they ſold their ſtock in trade when paper was a better commodity, and accumulating, by degrees, what grew every day worſe and worſe, alarm incited them to do any thing rather than keep in their poſſeſſion ſuch a depreciated currency; dreading the inevitable moment when it would be worthleſs, they feared to keep what a breath might diſſipate; they regarded it as an object of terror, and employed their workmen merely as a means of getting rid of what they knew carried a value merely nominal; and paid readily what they kept inſecurely.

Turn your eyes from France and view the commercial ſtate of England. Contemplate the immenſe—language cannot ſwell beyond the magnitude of reality,—the gigantic fabric reared on the induſtry of this kingdom: Throw into one vaſt amount the public funds,—the paper circulation of every ſpecies,—the gold and ſilver, whether money or plate,—the manufacturing eſtabliſhments that have raiſed new cities, as it were, by enchantment, —the capitals inveſted in roads, canals, and other

public works,—the ſhipping, magazines, and mercantile wealth of a thouſand kinds, and ſpread throughout the globe. How would this enormous total which, in England, has been nurſed to maturity by the fond tenderneſs of parental protection —how would it ſupport the ſtorm which the Rights of Man have kindled in France? Mortal would be the blow. To touch on ſuch a ſuppoſition is enough; every reader can picture the univerſal ſcene of ruin that would blot ſo fair a canvas. But how has this prodigious capital, riſing much above five hundred millions ſterling, been formed? BY THE SECURITY WHICH THE BRITISH CONSTITUTION GIVES TO PROPERTY: Not by equality, perſonal repreſentation, Rights of Man, Jacobiniſm, and the vile theories by which poor profligates, wanting to be rich rogues, become practical robbers! Such were not the paths of the commercial proſperity of Britain!

THE LABOURING INTEREST; the perſonal intereſt of the labouring poor has been attacked in an inſtance, the more remarkable as it was a ground of accuſation againſt the old government. Thoſe who recollect the complaints againſt it, on account of countrymen being enrolled for the militia, and conſequently liable to be called into ſervice, have probably read much, in the public

prints, of the number of *volunteers*, which flock from all parts of France to the armies on the frontiers. Until within theſe few days, I was ignorant and fooliſh enough to believe that theſe were *really* volunteers; but an Engliſh labourer, returning from a farm in France, to which I had ſent him, has explained to me the nature of this voluntary ſervice. All the men in the pariſh, able to ſerve, were enrolled, and then drew lots to ſee who ſhould go to form the number demanded; and, though an Engliſhman, my informant himſelf drew. Such is the mode of calling forth VOLUNTEERS, and ſo groſsly are we deceived by names, which under a ſemblance of freedom, cover the verieſt tyranny than can diſgrace a people, and preciſely in thoſe articles which, under the old government, were made the ſubject of the loudeſt complaint. When we ſhall read in future of the *eagerneſs* with which citizens *fly* to the frontiers, *l'empreſſement avec lequel tous les citoyens volent aux frontieres*, we ſhall know what it means. May not ſuch miſerables aſk, "What inducement has the farmer, while following the plough, to lay aſide his peaceful purſuits, and go to war with the farmer of another country? *

At firſt ſight it ſhould appear that a Revolution in England, in favour of principles of equality,

* Paine.

would

would be moſt favourable to the poor claſſes, the labouring part of the ſociety,—and yet, perhaps, in fact, being ſtill governed by the experiment of France, there is no claſs in the ſtate, the great landed poſſeſſors alone excepted, to whom it would prove ſo completely miſchievous. There is every reaſon to have confidence in the honeſty, moral feelings, and good intentions of the great maſs of our lower and poorer claſſes, and to be rationally certain, that in caſe of general confuſion, like that which has ruined France, they would abſolutely refuſe to become cut throats, blood hounds, and aſſaſſins: The maſs in France were honeſt alſo, but they were driven like ſheep by forward determined wretches who, getting together in arms, ſeized on the power which they pretended to aſſign to the people; plunder followed this, and the great body of the nation found, dreadfully to their coſt, that they had only changed maſters; but this change from a king to bands of ruffians, brought with it fruits of ſore digeſtion; money abſolutely diſappeared; the rich, who formerly gave employment, were hunted down, and deſtroyed like wild beaſts; the convulſions of the moment baniſhed the rich merchants and manufacturers; EMPLOYMENT, which converted labour into bread, was dried up with the ſprings that fed it. Amidſt the mockery of pay, if the poor workman cannot eat his aſſignats he

ſtarves

ſtarves—he has but one reſource—he dips them in blood;—with pike in hand he attacks the corn deſtined to ſatisfy the hunger of others; and the tragedy ſo often acted in that miſerable kingdom, is again performed till equality ends as every where elſe, in equality of ruin. "The manufacturers make nothing; nothing is bought; commerce is alive only in ſoldiers. I ſee nothing in trade but our imprudence and our blood. Nothing will ſoon be ſeen in France but miſery and paper *." This from the mouth of a Jacobin in the Convention! Can any doubt remain †?

* St. Juſt. Monit. Dec, 1.

† The price of wheat now, in many of the departments, is 4l. 10s. a quarter Engliſh; but as that price is paid in aſſignats, men not well informed, may imagine that the poor being themſelves paid in paper, might be proportionably able to buy; but the reverſe is the caſe; the paper while it has raiſed the price of bread has deſtroyed both manufactures and commerce, and is now attacking agriculture itſelf; the people are abſolutely without employment, and have no more the means to procure an aſſignat then a louis. This degree of miſery is not yet of a year ſtanding, for manufactures were active in ſome parts of France laſt ſpring. The affairs of that kingdom demand an attention that never ſleeps, or we are ſure to be deceived. The operation of the paper money has been very ſingular, for, to a certain period, it appeared to be beneficial; but *the line once paſſed*, every thing has been rapidly declining.

Nov. 26, at the bar the deputation from Loire and Eure tell the Convention: *The laws are without energy, and without vigour. The price of bread renders it inacceſſible to the poor.* MISERY IS AT ITS HEIGHT. *If the dearneſs continues the greateſt misfortunes may be expected.* With troops marching about the country to force the farmers to ſell their corn *at half* the current price, and yet half paid with aſſignats, nay, who ſeize it at any price.—"Illegal troops of men in many departments ſeize the corn in the markets without paying for it *."
"At Loviers 5 or 6000 workmen aroſe to force the magiſtrates to go at their head to ſeek corn in the graineries of the farmers. Laſt week, at Paſſy, they ſeized all that was in the market, while 600 others ſpread devaſtation through the foreſts †."

The ſtate of the roads (under the old government, the envy of Europe) is ſuch as would alone, without other addition, very much impede the tranſport of corn, and add to the ſcarcity in many ſituations. I am informed by a perſon who lately travelled acroſs the kingdom, that no repairs whatever have been done for three years paſt, and that he was informed, on enquiry, in ſeveral diſtricts,

* The miniſter of the Interior to the Convention, Nov. 28. Moniteur.

† Monit. Jan. 9.

that

that the people abſolutely refuſed to contribute either money or labour to mend them. The miniſter of the Interior, Jan. 6, complains to the Convention, that they are in a ſhocking ſtate of ruin; *dans un etat de delabrement epouvantable.* In a ſtate of anarchy, the object of roads may be thought ſmall, but it ſhews that in a point where the people themſelves are ſo intimately concerned, government for every purpoſe of doing good is abſolutely at an end, and that it remains for evil only. You aboliſh tythes, and feudal payments; the next ſtep is the people will not pay the land tax, and then will not repair the roads that are for their own uſe. Such is the ſtate, and there are politicians in England who tell us, all will end well in France, as if it were poſſible to remedy ſuch evils by new experiments. The abſolute and unequivocal reſtoration of the old government, with terrors in its train, not the beneficence of Louis XVI. ſeems now to be the only remedy,

IT WAS NOT THUS UNDER OLD GOVERNMENT; but they were not content. The next day the miniſter of the Interior writes to the Convention, complaining of the Commons of Paris, *in the midſt of abundance we are ready to periſh with famine. Such is the fruit of eternal declamation to heat the people. Adminiſtration is neglected: It is all a horrible*

rible diſorder. "Our food" ſay Saint Juſt, "has diſappeared, in proportion as our liberty has extended*." There, in two words, is the evil and the cauſe.

The deputation of the department of Loire and and Cher at the bar of the Convention, Nov. 26, declare an inſurrection of 25,000 men, on account of the high price of corn.—They aſſert, however, that there is corn enough in the country for a year, but the operations of the people, occaſion ſuch diſtreſs, that a poor woman of the pariſh of l'Hovital, went three times to the market of Romorentin for corn, but not being able to get it, ſhe went home, and, driven to exceſs of hunger, ſhe killed her infant, for which ſhe was ſince hanged †. This ſurely merits ſome attention from our labouring poor,—from thoſe claſſes of ſociety amongſt whom our Jacobin reformers diſtribute their poiſon of equality and Rights of Man. Theſe rights have produced delicious fruits in France, where the poor are driven to the gallows for KILLING THEIR OWN CHILDREN, TO PREVENT THEIR DYING OF FAMINE, *with corn enough in the country!!!* And it is for theſe rights, for ſuch equality, for this fine ſyſtem of French philoſophy and NEW LIGHTS; this moon ſhine of theoretical

* Monit. Dec. 1. † Monit. Nov. 27.

benefit,

benefit, but ſtarvation of practical fact, that our poor are to give up all their preſent comforts! To change what Old England gives them, whether good or bad, for *rights* that drive them, by famine, to kill their own children, amidſt Jacobin plenty; and then be hanged by that law which would have ſuffered them to die of hunger! Oh, John Bull! it is not thus that thy government treats wild beaſts. Thou mayſt be ſhut up in the tower, John, but thou wilt not be made to eat thy children! *Manuel.* "We ſee every day in the ſtreets, and even at the doors of the ſanctuary of the laws, miſerables who want both bread * and cloathing." "Our ſituation is ſuch" ſays a member of the Convention, "that tyranny will ſpring with victory and vengeance from popular commotions; and if the Rights of Man ſhall continue to exiſt, they will be written with the blood of the people on the tomb of liberty. The aſſylum of our farmers will be violated; the hope of future harveſts deſtroyed; and our nation become the jeſt of Europe.†" *This city illuſtrious, but miſerable,* ſaid the mayor of Paris, at the bar of the Convention, Jan. 3d. *Oh! were the good citizens to rally we ſhould ſee conſpirators repulſed in darkneſs as on the* 10*th of Auguſt.* Thus calling for new revolts—for new

* Monit. Dec. 11. † Saint Juſt. Mon. Dec. 1.

maſſacres

maſſacres ——The Rights of Man are WRITTEN IN THEIR BLOOD! This, the preſent language of Frenchmen, even in the National Convention. Here is experience of what thoſe bleſſed rights are which our Engliſh reformers are ſo deſirous of eſtabliſhing in this kingdom as the beſt boon of heaven! What a change have THE PEOPLE of that unhappy country experienced in the ſhort period of four years?

To contraſt this with the ſituation of the working poor in the manufacturing towns of England, would be an inſult to your underſtandings. You know, and what is much better you feel, that induſtry here meets its reward; that you are paid in hard caſh every ſaturday night; that you have ſomething better, for your ſunday dinner than an aſſignat; that a warm houſe covers you better than a branch of the tree of liberty; that a good coat, or ſtout pair of ſhoes, would be ill exchanged for a three coloured cockade; and laſtly, that whatever evil you have to complain of would be very ill remedied by any meaſures that tended ſooner or later to change your beef and pudding for frogs and ſoup meagre; your coal fires, for the pillaged ſticks of a national foreſt; your ſhuttles for a hatchet; or your hammer for a pike;

and

and the ſhillings and guineas of Old England for the paper aſſignats of Jacobin philoſophers.

Before I finiſh the detail of that unhappy and ruined country, it will not be unamuſing to contraſt the *regal evils* of France, with the *republican cures.*

Land taxes, the *evil*;——*cure*—ſeizing the land that paid them.——

Feudal quit-rents paid by the eſtate of the people, the *grievance*;——*remedy*—ſeizing the eſtate itſelf of the nobility and clergy.——

A deficit of 56 millions in the revenue, the *misfortune*;——*covered*—by a new deficit of 300 millions.——

Ten millions of royal paper, the *complaint*;—— three thouſand millions of aſſignats—the *cure.*

A national debt of 300 millions, the *malady*;—— one of 9000 millions, the *remedy.*

Marie Antonietta *condemned* for the follies of a necklace.——Mademoiſelle Theroigne *applauded* for leading priſoners to ſlaughter.——

The

The arbitrary government of Louis XVI.—*changed* —for the deſpotiſm of Marat.——

Drawing men for the militia, the *cruelty*;—forcing them into volunteer corps, the *favour*.——

Lawyers and ſuits, the *misfortune*;——*cure*— the ſummary juriſdiction of the lanthorn.——

Twenty-five millions, the expence of one king, the *burthen*;——150 millions the charge of 700 kings, the *eaſe*.

Seven priſoners in the Baſtile, the *grievance*;—— 7000 in the municipal dungeons, the *cure*.——

Trial by jury, *inſtituted*;——and 1200 throats cut in one night, in trial by pike.——

Militia.

In the preceding pages I have ſaid little of innovation: to declare againſt any meaſure, becauſe an innovation, is a conduct worthy of children, there are, in every period, moſt valuable innovations; Mr. Grenville's bill for trying conteſted elections was an innovation; the *habeas corpus* was an innovation; the Houſe of Commons itſelf was an innovation. The queſtion

now is not general; it is not for or againſt all innovation; but what the nature of the innovation ſhall be? There are ſome unqueſtionably wanted—while the ſpirit of equality is abroad—while all property—while life itſelf are menaced;—can it remain a doubt what thoſe innovations ſhould be? Exiſts there a man of property ſtupid enough to queſtion whether the innovations of this period ſhould not be directed to its ſecurity? Whether, inſtead of bringing forward the many-headed monſter into clubs of * riot, and aſſociations of confuſion?—whether, inſtead of nurſing a ſpirit, and cheriſhing a principle that has laid France in the duſt, we ought not to meditate innovations, that ſhall provide a mound againſt the billows when they ſhall flow; a ſhelter againſt the ſtorm when the hurricane ſhall come. The innovation we want, and ought with one voice to call for, is a

* It is ſcarce worth a note, to obviate the palpable objection, that clubs have met without riot, and aſſociations aſſembled without confuſion:—ſo they did once in France, but what did they end in? The moderate well-meaning men inſtituted ſome of thoſe clubs, and ſaw themſelves puſhed out or trampled down, by new comers who had nothing of moderation in their views. It will be ſo in all aſſociations into which men, without property, are admitted; they muſt always be moſt numerous, and the moſt violent propoſitions ever moſt to their taſte: they think that they have nothing to loſe—there is the pivot on which ſuch meetings turn, from, perhaps original good intentions to ultimate deſtruction.

MILITIA,

MILITIA, RANK AND FILE, OF PROPERTY.

Popular tyranny is a catching phrenzy; that will ſurely ſpread, if effective meaſures be not taken in time to prevent it. Every country in Europe depends, in the laſt reſort, on a ſoldiery taken from the dregs of the people, whoſe imaginary intereſt is to join inſurgents of whatever complexion. Such a reliance is, to the plaineſt apprehenſion, prepoſterous, and muſt, in the nature of things, fail in the long run. While danger, too manifeſt to queſtion, and too formidable to palliate, preſents itſelf on every ſide, nothing but infatuation can prevent ſome deciſive and efficient meaſure from being embraced; ſome ſyſtem of defence and ſecurity to property.

Were ſuch a militia eſtabliſhed, property would be ſecure; and thoſe who poſſeſs it might view, with a more calm patience, the attacks, whether inſidious or open, of men who poſſeſſing nothing from the arts of peace and tranquility, ſeek public confuſion, and to kindle the ſtorm on which to mount by the fall and ruin of others.

But, after all that can be ſaid, this idea of the diviſion of property is ſo ſweet a medicine to the great maſs of mankind, that it will find enthuſiaſ-

tic followers in every country, and no where more than in the ranks of an army; hence the neceſſity of property ſecuring itſelf, by being armed in a militia. A regiment of a thouſand cavalry in every county of moderate extent, juſt diſciplined enough to obey orders and keep their ranks, might be enrolled and aſſembled in companies three days in every year, and in regiments once in ſeven, at a very moderate expence to the public: ſuch an eſtabliſhment would give certain and permanent ſecurity againſt the miſchievous example of France, and the equally miſchievous propagation of principles in England, which tend to the ſame anarchy, civil war, and bloodſhed, that has reduced our neighbour to her preſent deſperate ſituation.

It has been ſaid, that ſuch a militia is impracticable: I will not reaſon on a caſe abſolutely new, but we may venture to aſſert, that a law which legalizes and regulates the mode in which all the land proprietors in the kingdom, who do not deſire the overthrow of the conſtitution, under the pretence of its improvement, may inſtantly aſſemble, armed, in troops and regiments, ready to oppoſe the friends of anarchy; I ſay that a law which prepares the means of ſecurity and *defence*, while the rage of *attack* unites and electrifies the enemies of peace and order, muſt be good, and may be eſſential to the ſalvation of the community. All re-

[ference

ference to former militia laws is beſide the queſtion—it was not of capital conſequence whether executed or not, but the preſent moment is perilous, the danger is too eminent to be trifled with; while anarchy is at our doors, determined meaſures can alone preſerve us.

Aſſociations.

NEXT to the eſtabliſhment of ſuch a militia, the preſent ſpirit of aſſociation amongſt the friends of the conſtitution, is a noble and genuine effort of feeling truly worthy Britons. There is no real friend to his country that does not rejoice to ſee this electric ſtroke of true patriotiſm ſpread with vital energy through the empire: it carries confuſion to Jacobiniſm: it gives confidence in a juſt cauſe, and ſecurity to every generous boſom. Rapidly as the effort has ſhot, with genial influence through our counties, it could not be expected that the views would be uniformly directed to the ſame determinate objects. In a little time the ſcope and meaning will be well impreſſed, and then it will doubtleſs be found neceſſary to fix on places of rendezvous to which honeſt men may reſort when the wicked are abroad. The national ſpirit is at laſt rouſed; it has ſeen long enough the deſperate and abominable aſſociations of thoſe,

who *do* wiſh and *did* openly demand the overthrow of our excellent Conſtitution, under pretences of Jacobin reformation: we have ſeen the danger—we have been ſhocked at the inſolent threats of "Invincible mobs," we have ſought the right means of ſafety; with a vigour of defence equal to the malignity of attack, a great nation will prove that ſhe is not to be inſulted with impunity. Had ſuch aſſociations exiſted in France, or any thing tending to them at the early ſtage of the Revolution, all the horrors that flowed from it might have been prevented; but the higher orders of ſociety knew not their danger—Here the caſe is directly contrary.—We are inſtructed by their calamitous experience—and of all effective means to be ready to meet a ſtorm, this of aſſociation is (next to a militia of property) the moſt direct.

It may be ſaid with truth, that a moment never yet occurred, which demanded equally the united, firm, and determined aſſiſtance—the heart and hand of men, friends of peace, to prevent, while yet it is poſſible to prevent, the horrors that ſo lately awaited us. It is a moment that ought to bring political agitation to every boſom——The queſtion concerns not empires, kings, and miniſters alone—it comes borne to our fortunes, our houſes, our families: Will you, by the nerve and vigour of your meaſures, by the broad baſis of

univerſal property, on which you build the aſſociations, by the prudence of the reſolutions, and the energy of their execution, will you avoid the miſeries of France? Liſten not to the inſidious pretences of Jacobin reformers—there is no medium in moments like theſe.—With the example of France in full diſplay, propoſitions of reform, which in that kingdom produced only conflagration and maſſacre, will, in this, have the effect of putting the nation on its guard againſt men, who ſo openly profeſs a readineſs to ſtake all we enjoy, on the deſperate throw of a new Revolution. This is the queſtion that ought to collect the enemies of Jacobiniſm, and which ought *to have a ſeaſonable influence on all the orders of Society, by which they may know and learn that we ſhall ever rally round the conſtitution* *, uncontaminated by *reforms*, or the *tree of liberty*, the true ſymbol of Jacobin confuſion. The danger has leſſened ſince government has awakened to the nature of the preſent criſis, and ſince the admirable ſpirit of the people has manifeſted itſelf, the enemies of the public peace will not dare now to profeſs thoſe Jacobin tenets, which, till lately, met us in ſuch a multitude of ſhapes: They will put on the garb of more moderate and more temperate meaſures—they will now appear merely in the character of

* Mr. Fox's Speech to the Whig Club.—RIDGWAY's.

reformers—a character more dangerous perhaps, becauſe more maſked and inſidious: not leſs pointed in effect to equality and ſedition; for theſe men know ſufficiently, by the great experiment of France, that an equal perſonal repreſentation of the people would infallibly produce here, as it did there, the abſolute ruin of all legal authorities. This character of a reformer ought, therefore, to be an object of as much jealouſy and diſtruſt, as that of a profeſſed Jacobin; and the aſſociations ſpreading ſo laudably through the kingdom, ſhould be on their guard equally againſt them and their doctrines. The proſperity of England, as neutral, is an eye-ſore to the Jacobins, and, as an enemy, an object of terror. The queſtion, then, is the means theſe cunning leaders are taking to ſpread the ſame confuſion through this country, that has ruined theirs; moſt aſſuredly they will not open ſhops, and write JACOBIN over the doors—No; they know their buſineſs better—they find materials much more to their purpoſe; they find half their work done to their hands by our *Oppoſition*-men, and our *reformers* of the conſtitution. Seeing that the *reſult* of the labours of ſuch men anſwers exactly their own *views*, they chime in, and cry reform! with a more energetic vociferation than ever they did *a la lanterne* in France. Their views, and this union of the Jacobin deſtroyers, with the Engliſh reformers, ought to

open

open the eyes of honeſt men, and make them, one and all, unite in the firmeſt aſſociations. Not in the milk and water declarations of loyalty *, that

* In great numbers of the aſſociations, there ſeems to have been a marked attention in drawing up their declarations of loyalty and veneration for the conſtitution, either to uſe phraſes of equivocal meaning, or that might be palatable to reformers, as if it was a wiſh to include all deſcriptions of men, whatever their political ſentiments: If ſuch management had been carried a little further, declarations would have been produced, which direct Jacobins would have ſigned; but the original intention was wrong, and tended ſtrongly to weaken the force and vigour of aſſociation. In the rational terror of a perilous moment, and ſtruck with a common ſenſation of common danger, men fly to aſſociation, to ſecure them againſt the attacks of men already aſſociated to deſtroy them: At ſuch an inſtant, what can be ſo futile, what can be ſuch imbecility, as to ſeek, by an ill-timed complaiſance of candour, ſo to expreſs their feelings, that aſſociators of a direct contrary complexion, men who profeſſedly ſeek to change the conſtitution on French principles, (for there has not been a ſingle propoſition of reform that is not on thoſe principles) that ſuch men may be induced hypocritically to unite with you? The weakneſs of ſuch a proceeding is inexecuſable. On the contrary, theſe declarations ought all of them to have been ſo framed, as expreſsly and purpoſely to exclude a union with men ſo dangerous, as thoſe who would not feel a horror at the idea of tampering with the conſtitution, at ſuch a ſeaſon as this:—By ſuch an excluſion, it would be found, that, however numerous the reformers were before the 10th of Auguſt, that at preſent not one man in a thouſand would liſten, with patience, to hear the word Reform ſeriouſly pronounced; nor fail to deprecate the idea, as pregnant with national ruin.

mean any thing or nothing, and will be forgotten in ſix months, but in the moſt vigorous oppoſition to every idea of reform on principles of giving more power to the people:—Here lies our danger in the preſent moment; it is not the rank Jacobin with bare and bloody arms, pike in hand, and ready for your throat; it is his gentleman uſher, your modeſt reformer, who, meaning a great deal, aſks a little, and knows how to make that little much. But be not ſo cajoled—reſiſt ALL CHANGES in that conſtitution, which gives you the means of wealth, and protects you in the enjoyment. Come to reſolutions declaratory of the abhorrence of changes; and of every propoſition for ſuch that does not originate in the legiſlature; and petition Parliament to render illegal all meetings and clubs, whoſe object is to make experiments on Britiſh happineſs; to diſcover rights better than thoſe of an Engliſhman; to change your laws, religion, and government; and give you, in lieu of them, the NEW LIGHTS OF FRENCH PHILOSOPHY.

If any man doubts whether I have reaſon for theſe aſſertions, let him conſider the tranſaction of the Society that call themſelves the Conſtitutional Society of London. Here is the French regiſter of their application to the Convention, Nov. 27. *Similar Societies with ours are actually forming in all parts of England.* Applauſes.

After

After the example which France has given Revolutions become eaſy: It will not be extraordinary, in a ſhort ſpace of time, if it ſhould happen, that felicitations ſhould arrive to a National Convention in England. New applauſes *. It has been ſaid, even in Parliament, ſince Government was ſufficiently alarmed to call out the militia, and put the nation on her guard, that the King's Miniſters ought to be impeached for their conduct. Can any one doubt whether the men who ſent that infamous deputation, and the men who compoſed it, would not avow directly the ſame opinion? But let the people at large know, by theſe abominable facts, the unqueſtionable reality of their danger. Let them here diſcover—their intellects muſt be weak indeed, if they cannot diſcover, in this deputation, what thoſe men mean who drink equal liberty to all mankind—NATIONAL CONVENTIONS EQUALLY EVERY WHERE!! is the ſentiment of their boſoms, and would have been ſung about the ſtreets, had Government ſlept ſix weeks longer. Who can read without horror the following Addreſs to the Volunteer Corps of Ireland, from an Iriſh Society of the ſame complection, ſo lately as Dec. 20. "Citizen ſoldiers to arms. When your country has been declared in danger, we conjure you by your glory to ſtand to your arms, and in ſpite of a police, in ſpite of a fencible militia, to

* Moniteur, Nov. 29.

maintain

maintain good order: it is only by military array that you can obtain the ſpeedy reſurrection of liberty and equality." Here is abundant proof that we are far diſtant from entire ſafety; and that the leaſt relaxation in that aſſociated preparation, which is now our only ſalvation, would give new animation to theſe ſocieties of deſperate men with deſperate views; to theſe enemies of government, of order, and of property.

While the ſpirit of the people is alert and animated with due zeal in defence of their lives and properties, both may be ſafe: but this exertion is not likely to be durable; and ſhould that languor and indolence, the children of a fooliſh ſecurity, once more ſlacken the tenſion which reſults from the preſent impreſſion; the courage of our enemies will revive; and thoſe execrable ſocieties, whoſe aim is plunder, and the means confuſion, will reſume the ſame pernicious activity in miſchief that has effected the ruin of France, and had brought England almoſt to the brink of the ſame precipice down which her neighbour has been hurled. To guard againſt a neglect ſo fatal, becomes the firſt and greateſt duty of government. It is firmneſs, energy, and vigour, againſt our domeſtic foes that can alone preſerve the conſtitution uncontaminated by Jacobin reform; moderation, lenity, and the mild virtues of one man, have deluged France in blood; ſuch are not weapons

with

with which to combat in an hour like this: while the lamp-poſt, or the pike, is the imprimatur on the preſs in France; while ſuſpicion fills the priſons, and maſſacre is the gaol delivery—if the Legiſlature of England does not take precautions, energic and effective, but truſts too much to private efforts, we may, in the event, amidſt confuſion and terror, have reaſon to regret a want of policy, which an example ſo pregnant ought to have inſpired.

Nor ought either government or the public to be driven from their purpoſe by the anſwer not uncommonly heard, which accuſes the aſſociators of going to the contrary extreme, and endangering the liberty of the people by profeſſions of loyalty; this accuſation may be conſidered as the laſt effort of diſappointed ſedition: the men who feel with the deepeſt chagrin the ſecurity ſuch aſſociations give to the conſtitution, as at preſent eſtabliſhed, have nothing left during the vigour now exerted, but to retort accuſations—and to tell us, that we mean, or act as if we meant, to render the King abſolute: but ſuch aſſertions ſcarcely merit attention: thoſe men, if there are ſuch, who wiſhed before to change our government to a deſpotiſm, certainly wiſh it now; but that aſſociations directly declaring a determination to maintain the conſtitution *as it is*—free as it is now—mean really

an

an intention to overturn it, is too prepoſterous to be credited—and worthy only of the reforming quarter from which it proceeds.

But neither a militia, aſſociation, nor any other meaſure to be deviſed would yield ſecurity were the licentiouſneſs (not the liberty) of the preſs to be permitted to ſo ſhameful and deſtructive a length, as we have of late years experienced in England. It will probably be found after this period that no conſtitution, whether good or bad, can poſſibly exiſt againſt a licentious preſs. The old government of France was ruined unqueſtionably by inattention to this engine: the new tyranny eſtabliſhed there are well aware of that momentous truth, and have accordingly converted it like the lanthorn into an engine of government. Were the licentiouſneſs of the preſs is in any degree allowed, the general inſtruction of the lower claſſes muſt become the ſeed of revolt, and it is for this reaſon that the friends of reform, and zealous admirers of French equality, are ſtrenuous for ſunday and charity ſchools.

The gentlemen who conſider Paine as a *conſpicuous friend of mankind, and an admirable writer* *, would have a ſyſtem of national education eſtabliſhed, in which every perſon may become in-

* Mr. Cooper's Reply to Mr. Burke's Invective, p. 75.

formed

formed what are the *rights of a citizen* †; what *privileges* they are *deprived of* ‡, and how to bring *capabilities into action* by a *glorious career of* improvement. The French have been wonderfully well inſtructed in all this; they have indeed brought their capabilities into action; they have not been wanting in *leiſure, unremittingly employed*, or in *beſt endeavours exerted to haſten* § improvement. Since aſſociations are found to diſtribute treaſon and ſedition, to teach the exertion of capabilities, and to point out the glorious career of France as an object of imitation for England; the poiſon thus expanded, does not render the vehicle more reſpectable. I do not find on my farm, in the village, or its vicinity, that thoſe are the beſt ploughmen and carters who are the deepeſt adepts in the Rights of Man. If there muſt be hewers of wood and drawers of water, why preach equality? Will not French horrors tell us, that to teach, is to bewilder; that to enlighten, is to deſtroy?

† P. 75. ‡ P. 76.

§ Mr. Cooper ſays of the approach of the Revolution he looks for in England, the *dawn of a glorious day* (p. 12.): "my leiſure ſhall be unremittingly employed, and my beſt endeavours "exerted to haſten its approach." p. 77. Doubtleſs well prepared for the buſineſs by his converſations with Mademoiſelle Theroigne, of whom he ſays, "I have ſeldom met with views "more enlarged, more juſt, more truly patriotic."

But

But, contrary to all this, with a preſs regulated for the benefit of ſociety, and not vomiting forth poiſon for its deſtruction, the lower claſſes cannot well be injured by inſtruction: what a duty then devolves on government to guard againſt abuſes, the neglect of which may be attended with danger, and even ruin to the whole community.

I feel but one great objection that may probably be made to the general concluſions I have drawn from the example of France: it may be ſaid that my reaſoning goes too far, becauſe if juſt, a nation however enſlaved, and however miſerable, ſhould ſubmit to all evils rather than attempt the greater evil of a Revolution. The argument is common, and, diſſected by reaſoning, would lead on both ſides into a diſcuſſion that would here be miſplaced. But reaſoning is endleſs, and facts are few, one motive, were there no other, for preferring them.

In the former revolutions of the modern world, whether in Sweden, Switzerland, Portugal, Holland, or England, the people ſoon ſettled into a form of government nearly reſembling that which they had enjoyed before the troubles, they never dreamed of making new experiments *on principle*. Even in the caſe of America the fact holds true in almoſt every inſtance; for there is not now in the world

world a conſtitution ſo near the Britiſh as that of the United States; I think, *ſince the events in France*, that it is inferior, for the plain reaſon of not providing ſo well againſt the danger now moſt to be apprehended, *popular power:* the deſpotiſm of a monarch was every where the object of rational apprehenſion; it is ſo no longer: a worſe monſter has ſhewn itſelf in the world, that carries a venom in its fangs more *rabid* than the canine. In all former revolutions, therefore, the people reaſoned in argument, and felt in fact, that whatever might be the event of a ſtruggle, it could ſcarcely place them in a worſe ſituation; and this with exception only to America. Experiment therefore juſtified the nations who felt themſelves oppreſſed in the attempts they made to effect a revolution.

Reverſe the medal, and let us aſk how this great queſtion ſtands at preſent: the principles of equality and Rights of Man are afloat, and an *experimentum crucis* tells us, that a nation, though under a very bad government, may change for one a thouſand times worſe. This great and diſaſtrous event will give men, let their rank be what it may—the honeſt workman equally with the prince—a horror at the idea of revolutions; will teach men rather to bear the ills they have, than fly to others that they know not of; and conſequently has done

more againſt the cauſe of that real and ſafe liberty which was gradually pervading the world, than any other event in the power of miſchief to effect. A reflection that ought to make us loathe a Jacobin with the ſame deteſtation as noxious animals of hideous deformity.

Take the worſt of the German military governments, and compare the ſituation of the people in any point whatever, and it may be aſſerted truly that they are in a happier and better ſituation than the French under the anarchy given them by the Rights of Man: to anſwer that this anarchy may ſubſide and produce a good government at laſt, is ſo compleatly beſide the queſtion, reaſoning on facts, that I am aſtoniſhed to hear it ſo often recurred to; the experiment of the new government in France was compleat—it was finiſhed—decreed and accepted—It is farcical to ſuppoſe that Louis XVI. had more power to ſap or deſtroy it than any other king: if it could not go on with him, it could not go on at all, and therefore was rotten at heart. It had made a thouſand proviſions againſt a diſarmed king, but had made none againſt an armed mob: this mob broke into the ſanctuary and kicked the conſtitution out of doors. Maſſacres followed, till no man felt his head more ſafe on his ſhoulders than the ſubjects of Achen or Algiers; and, as to property, it was given to the winds: where

where are the ſubjects of a German deſpot whoſe ſituation matches this? And as to the *hope* of ſeeing ſomething better; the hope of the German is more likely to be realized than that of the Frenchman, who has nothing in perſpective but new evils and new revolutions to cure them. A German, therefore, would be wiſe to renounce the thoughts of liberty, rather than purſue the idea of it through a revolution ſimilar to that of France. Time and a happy coincidence of events may give them ſuch an opportunity as France, worſe than loſt. They have her example to inſtruct them.

The plain concluſion to be drawn is this; nations ſhould proceed as individuals; rely only on experimented caſes. When philoſophers adviſed the French to ſeek ſome ſyſtem of freedom better than experiment *(Great Britain)* offered, they adviſed a truſt in theory; and at this moment when Jacobins and reformiſts adviſe us to *improve* our conſtitution, is it not a queſtion directly in point to aſk them, whether the experimented freedom we enjoy at preſent ought to be hazarded on projects of theory? An unequal repreſentation, rotten boroughs, long parliaments, extravagant courts, ſelfiſh miniſters, and corrupt majorities, are ſo intimately interwoven with our practical freedom, that it would require better political anatomiſts than our modern reformers, to

ſhew on fact that we did not owe our liberty to the identical evils which they want to expunge. In France none of theſe are to be found, a repreſentation equal, no burgage tenures, biennial parliaments, no court, miniſters of ſtraw, and majorities corrupted only by themſelves, but with theſe envied bleſſings is France free?—Here is an equal repreſentation of the people—an experiment compleat—and the reſult "heavenly" in the eye of Engliſh reformers; but not ſo in the mouths even of Jacobins in the Convention—THEY tell you that it is anarchy, bloodſhed, and famine. "The abolition of formal government brings ſociety cloſer together," is one of Paine's mountebank maxims; his theories ſhould always be brought to the teſt of French practice; this compreſſure, this contact of ſociety, is there well underſtood; it is the pike of one man in the belly of another. Is this ſo very encouraging as to induce an imitation in England? It is not, however, ſufficient to ſatisfy thoſe who demand a reform; no ſlight reaſon for ſuppoſing they look further—and that through the obſcure of ſuch a foreground, there is a proſpect behind, bright enough to fix attention, and allure hope—the proſpect of copying in England the example of France; the regal, noble, eccleſiaſtical, national properties, the ſpoil of *equal citizens!*

There is in Monſ. Mounier's laſt admirable performance an obſervation which merits great attention; that when once a kingdom poſſeſſes a free aſſembly, with the power of the purſe, the real apprehenſion is not for liberty, but for the exiſtence of the crown. And again, "In England the number of repreſentatives of the people is very unequally divided: Simple boroughs, which contain few inhabitants, have, from cuſtom, the right of deputing; while diſtricts, very populous, do not participate in elections. This irregularity appears contrary to many inconteſtible principles; but it could not be rectified without augmenting the force of the democratical part of the government, without danger of breaking the equilibrium, which has been ſo well preſerved for a century; and if ever they conſent to render the repreſentation more equal, it would be indiſpenſable to ſtrengthen the other two branches. Inequality of repreſentation, above all, produces this advantage; that a great part of the people *identify* themſelves much leſs with the deputies of the commons, and the public opinion is leſs corrupted by the paſſions that may agitate the lower houſe*." There is deep ſenſe in this remark: The author, who is one of the beſt of men, and moſt honeſt of politicians,

* Recherches ſur les Cauſes qui ont empeche les François de devenir Libres, 1792, tom 2, p. 272.

who

who was a leader in the conſtituent aſſembly, and marked, with great acumen, their errors, felt the truth he here delineats, and ſaw the overthrow of their conſtitution in the eagerneſs with which the people, incorporated as it were, with the deputies, till thoſe without talents became as corrupt as thoſe whoſe only talent was corrupting the hearts of others. What fact, what experiment, do our reformers pretend to, on which to ground the certainty, that if thoſe apparent defects of the conſtitution were removed, the power of the people, without property, would not, in conſequence, gain enough——to enable them to gain more——and to advance by means of thoſe ſteps ——till they gained *all?* The caſe of the French revolution is much ſtronger in the affirmative than any other to be produced in the negative; but to ſpeak of caſes is abſurd, with the reformers, for they proceed abſolutely on theory and Rights of Man; thoſe well adapted foundations for a republic in Bedlam.

There appears to me to be a ſingular propriety in the aſſociations which are at preſent ſpreading through the kingdom, petitioning parliament to paſs an act to declare all clubs, aſſociations, ſocieties and meetings of men, that aſſemble for the purpoſe of obtaining changes in the conſtitution, illegal, and that no meeting can le-

gally correſpond, either in their own name, or in the names of their ſecretary, or other officer, with any foreign body or government, unleſs ſuch meeting is ſanctioned by charter. The friends of order and good government are now collected, the time is precious, and ought not to be loſt; and while we are threatened with the horrors of anarchy, it behoves us to have as much activity and energy in our defence as the violators of all human rights have exerted in their attack: for men to tell us in ſuch a moment as this, and ſituated as we are with the enemy of mankind, triumphant on one ſide, and the torch of revolt lighting in Ireland on another ſide—that they are not Jacobins, but moderate men, wiſhing *reform*, is as impudent as it would be for a thief to ſay that he is not an aſſaſſin, becauſe he only held a candle while another cut my throat.

That governments cannot be improved, and that legiſlation ſhould be the only ſcience to ſtand ſtill, by no means follows: experiment proſcribes only great changes; ſmall and gradual advances, in times of ſerenity; ſuch advances as put nothing to hazard, muſt be good. It is eaſy to lay the finger on grievances in England, which every honeſt and moderate man would wiſh removed; but it is not when much is demanded, that little

ſhould

ſhould be given; for the plain reaſon that the little will not THEN ſatisfy.

I ſhall not be ſuſpected of thinking tythes a light grievance; but they are a grievance that would be ill remedied by the loſs of the crop that pay them; the enormity of the taxes I pay is known to every man that reads the tracts I publiſh; heavy as they are, let them remain rather than be changed for a *contribution fonciere*; the little left me is my own, which might not be the caſe under the pure diſpenſations of Jacobin equality. Evils certainly exiſt in our ſyſtem, and they are ſuch as will, I truſt, be remedied, gradually, by the legiſlature, acting from its own impulſe; and not from the influence of clubs and reforming ſocieties.

It was an old obſervation, that a republic could ſubſiſt on the trappings of a monarchy. The French have ſet the ſeal of experience here, as in every other caſe, and have ſhewn that citizen Roberſpierre, and citizen Rolland, can out do *Emperor Joſeph*, and *King George*, in extravagance; the moſt enormous expences, that ever any nation was deluged with, are the preſent in France; a ſingle month's DEFICIENCY is 176 millions, or 7,700,000l. ſterling; this is ſpending at the rate of 90 milllions a year. Paine ſays, "It is cruel to think of a million

lion a year to a king; but it is not a breakfaſt to an aſſembly of citizens. There is a great deal in the civil liſt of England that does not concern *trappings*. The payment, for the ſupport of thoſe trappings, do not probably amount to ſixpence a head upon the population of Great Britain, for which ſixpence every man has the ſupport of a chief conſtable that keeps all the other conſtables to their duty. Inſtead of ſixpence a head paid for tranquility; the French *now* pay five ſhillings a head for keeping a gang of cut throats, and an aſſembly of mad dogs. A ſplendid imperial court might be ſupported out of ſomething worſe than trappings of the French republic.

If France ſhould ever again poſſeſs the precious moment of improving her government without convulſions, which opportunity ſhe had, and loſt; or if any other great country, having an indigent poor, ſhould meet ſuch a moment——experiment ſpeaks to them but one language.——TAKE THE BRITISH CONSTITUTION, not becauſe it is theoretically the beſt, but becauſe it is practically good; but take ſpecial care not to miſtake that conſtitution, and give the poiſon of perſonal repreſentation, for in ſuch an error your import of Britiſh liberty would become the eſtabliſhment of French anarchy.

* * * *

The concluſion of the whole may be compreſſed in a few lines; the danger of the moment is great indeed; and only to be guarded againſt by the moſt unremitted diligence and activity:—Exert that diligence, and bring that activity into play by a unanimous ſupport of the adminiſtration, entruſted at preſent with the public ſafety: The queſtion is not whether you are a friend or an enemy of that adminiſtration; you are certainly a friend to the lives and properties of mankind. Join in aſſociations for our defence againſt banditti, cut throats, and Jacobins; join againſt an enemy more ſubtle, and, therefore, more dangerous, the friends of reform; the aſſociators who would plant the tree of equal liberty; the mountebanks who have a French noſtrum, and Birmingham daggers, for the diſeaſes of our Engliſh conſtitution. Guard againſt ſuch miſcreant attempts by pointed reſolutions; and call, with one voice, on the legiſlature to ſuppreſs, by vigorous and deciſive laws, the clubs of ſedition; the aſſociations that call themſelves our "conſtitutional" inſtructors and our "friends;" whoſe leſſons are inſtitutes of anarchy; and whoſe friendſhip, — ſhould their tenets prevail,—would cement with our beſt blood, that National Convention of Britain with which thoſe ſocieties have ſo lately threatened us.

5 JA 59

FINIS.

APPENDIX.

IN a period ſo abounding with events, or rather with atrocities, like the preſent, it is ſcarcely poſſible for the moſt rapid pen to keep pace with the new efforts which are making for the introduction of real French horrors, as remedies to the imaginary evils of theſe kingdoms.

The "*Proceedings of the Aſſociation of the Friends of the Conſtitution.* Dublin. The Duke of Leinſter!! in the chair," is a publication that deſerves notice; becauſe it proves, too clearly to be doubted, that our dangers are not at an end. Jacobiniſm hardly ſleeps, in ſpite of all our aſſociations; the enemies of law and of order never relax their efforts; Ireland is their favourite ground; and ſhould theſe new principles of equality, the new French "lights," be there eſtabliſhed, it will not be long before they are raging in our own vitals. Theſe "friends" call on the people to "SUBDUE the corruption," "the infamy," "the fouleſt acts under the fouleſt names," which form the "regular ſyſtem of government," by "a RADICAL REFORM;" by a body of "repreſentatives,

an integral and eſſential part of the conſtitution, derived from the people by GENERAL election." —The Engliſh language could ſcarcely, in an equal number of words, paint in ſtronger terms the fire-brands of ſedition. To call on the people not to crave, or pray, or petition, but to SUBDUE the errors of government,—to SUBDUE them by a RADICAL reform, and GENERAL repreſentation, is, in other words, to demand a Convention, the King at Tyburn, the Lords annihilated, and Property the reward of new Roberſpieres, Briſſots, and Marats. But theſe expreſſions are too remarkable to be accidental; they coincide too exactly with the threats of the Jacobins in France, to allow us, for one moment, to believe that there is not a clear intelligence and union between them.

The miniſter of the marine, to the friends of liberty and equality in the maritime cities: "Will the ENGLISH REPUBLICANS SUFFFR the King and his Parliament to make war? Already theſe free men teſtify their diſcontent and their repugnance to carry arms againſt their French brothers. Well; we will fly to THEIR ASSISTANCE; we will invade that iſle, and ſend 50,000 caps of liberty to plant the SACRED TREE, and to offer our open arms to our REPUBLICAN BROTHERS, to PURIFY Engliſh liberty, and REFORM the vices of the government." Here the Jacobins threaten *to purify our liberty, in conjunction with Engliſh republicans, and*

to

to reform our vices with 50,000 *bayonets.* What is this but to *ſubdue us by a radical reform!!!* If any doubt could remain of the tendency of the operations of our reformers, ſurely ſuch declarations are ſufficient to remove them? To open our eyes to the horrible ſituation we ſhould be in, if our legiſlature were abſurd enough to liſten to ſuch incendiaries; or weak enough not to take effective meaſures to controul their treaſonable practices.

Very much in the ſame ſpirits, as the Iriſh Friends, is Lord Sempil, D. Adams, Joel Barlow, and J. Froſt, in the name of the London Conſtitutional Society, congratulating the Convention on the revolution of the 2d of September, and hoping that other nations would ſoon follow their example; preſenting their cut-throats at the ſame time with 1000 pair of ſhoes, and 1000l. in money *. To give ſuch felicitations and hopes, the 28th of November was approbation direct of the 2d of September.

Page 11.—*Inſurrection againſt the National Convention.*

The deputies of the department of Loire, tell the Convention at the bar, *Your ſcandalous debates are known in every corner of France. The afflicted*

* *Pol. State,* No. 12.

people ſent you to make laws, and you know not how to make a regulation; they ſent you to render France reſpected, and you know not how to reſpect it yourſelves; they ſent you to eſtabliſh liberty, and you have not known how to maintain your own. You tremble before theſe tribunes *.

Paine is of an opinion directly contrary, "they ſprang not from the filth of rotten boroughs—they debate in the language of gentlemen—their dignity is ſerene—they preſerve the right angled character of man." We well know what their language is; and if a right angled character produces right angled actions, we know what thoſe are alſo. For the ſerenity of their dignity!!!—It is a fit ſubject for mirth but not for argument.

Page 12.—*Firſt great cauſe of all.*

Jan. 16, The miniſter of the interior to the committee of general ſafety; *every day for a month paſt, they have talked of renewing the proſcriptions; I have, for many days, received and laid before you aſſurances of projects of maſſacre and murder, publickly preached.*

Page 13.—*Reſpecting the laws.*

What multiplied proofs of that fact, that without a king, and ſome *body* between the king and

* Monit. Jan. 10, 1793.

the

the people, where there is an indigent poor, all falls to confuſion. The Jacobin Rabbeau once knew this:——

" Dans un grand empire il faut abſolument des hommes décorés, ſans quoi l'etat tombera dans une vaſte popularité, dans une immenſe democratie, qui doit finir par l'anarchie, ou par le deſpotiſme ſelon que le prince ou le peuple ſeront l'un ou l'autre, le plus fort." *

The Nation, ſays Paine, *not Parliament, ſhould reform abuſes: the idea of vitiated bodies reforming themſelves is a paradox.* Exactly in proportion then to a nation interfering and taking the remedy of abuſes into its own hands ſhould be the effect in wiping them out. Apply to France for a commentary on this text. Has it been ſo? As *ſhe* advanced in *reform*, did abuſes diſappear? Never was doctrine ſo belied by events as the doctrine of this great politician.

Page 15.—*Go to Rights of Man.*

Perhaps experience will juſtify us in aſſerting, that that government is beſt which is beſt calculated to ſtand ſtill and do nothing; becauſe the thing wanted in government is not activity, but repoſe; and to do nothing is nineteen times in twenty better than readily to do any thing. The

* *Conſiderations ſur les Interêts du Tiers Etat.* Par Rabbeau St. Etienne. 1788. 2d edit. P. 641.

vetos of different orders, or houſes, therefore muſt be good, as they are ſo many impediments to action. No government is ſo reſtleſsly active as a pure democracy, voting in a ſingle aſſembly; the mob are ſatisfied no longer than a torrent of events keeps them in breathleſs expectation. We ſee, in the caſe of France, that ſuch buſtle is the energy of miſchief, the motion of deſpotiſm. Their late ſucceſſes, ſo unlooked for and ſurpriſing, made them ſpeak commonly, in the ſtreets of Paris, of conquering Europe; ſhould farther ſucceſs attend their arms, they will infallibly attempt it. The leaders, who owe their importance to the preſent hurricane of events, would ſink too low in a calm, for ſuch men to allow the ſtorm to ſubſide.

Page 29.—*Comment on the text.*

The abuſes and plunder in the ſale of the poſſeſſions of the emigrants, may be eaſily conceived from the complaint which Sillery makes in the Convention:—"The furniture of the chateau of Nangus, belonging to the Baron de Bretueil, was worth at leaſt 1,500,000 liv. and has produced ſcarcely any thing. Six tapeſtries of the Gobelins, which coſt 30,000 liv. in money, were ſold for 2800 liv. in aſſignats. A clock, that coſt 24,000 liv. in money, ſold for 800 in paper *." Such is the

* Monit. Dec. 31, 1792.

virtuous

virtuous adminiſtration of the *res-publica* among republicans!

Page 45.—*His head on a pike.*

And the miniſter Rolland, who, in his impudent letter to the King, ſaid, that as *the voice of truth is not heard in courts, revolutions become neceſſary*, now, crouching under the uplifted pike, finds, in the diſpenſations of Jacobin juſtice, that the voice of truth is heard as little in conventions as in courts, and curſes the folly that called for revolutions.

Page 48.—*Popular deſpotiſm.*

The federates at the bar, January 13th:—"*The public force is diſorganized, and poniards intimidate the good citizens.*

Spare not the liberticide members, who vote in favour of Louis, we devote them to infamy.—Marſeilles to the Sections of Paris.

Page 51.—*French theory.*

The declaration of rights, ſays Paine, *is of more value to the world than all the laws and ſtatutes that have yet been promulgated. It ſtares corruption in the face. The venal tribe are all alarmed: from ſuch oppoſition the revolution receives an homage. The*

more it is ſtruck, the more ſparks it will emit; *and* THE FEAR IS IT WILL NOT BE STRUCK ENOUGH. I copy this inſanity to bring to the reader's recollection the confidence with which this chartalan predicted in oppoſition to the predictions of Mr. Burke; *whoſe ideas*, he ſays, *tumbled over and deſtroyed one another, for want of a polar truth.* The polar truths, by which Paine ſteered acroſs the boundleſs and unfathomable ocean of the French revolution, make one ſmile; he now finds, ſorely to the coſt of his reputed penetration, that all the polarity which guided him was a *will-o'-the-wiſp* meteor, that led his frail bark o'er rocks and quick-ſands:—yet ingulphed as he is, he ſays, *Mr. Burke takes a ground of ſand.* Events have amply told us which of them was upon ſand.

Page 71.—*Direct defiance.*

I mean in the fundamentals of the conſtitution, ſuch as maintaining the monarchy, &c.; in many ſecondary objects of importance, the Conſtituent Aſſembly obeyed their cahiers, as I have ſhewn in another place. What that Aſſembly did that was good, is however of the leaſt poſſible conſequence, for the plaineſt of all reaſons; they formed, at the ſame time, a Conſtitution that could not ſupport itſelf, and conſequently the good things they did were committed to the winds. Whatever has appeared

peared reſpectable in repreſentation in France, was in that firſt Aſſembly; the ſecond was mob; and for the third the kennels were ſwept. The ſecond, at one ſtroke, knocked down all that was built by the firſt. It remains yet to be ſeen whether the third will not do the ſame by the ſecond; every ſtep they have hitherto taken has been a page from the code of anarchy.

Page 71.—*Dethroned the King,*

And murdered him by a majority of *five* voices, though their law required three-fourths at leaſt for declaring guilt, or for pronouncing death; and the majority obtained by the menaces of the aſſaſſins paid by *Egalité.* The conſummation of political infamy! The murder of the beſt prince that ever ſat upon the throne of France: the only monarch that country ever knew, that was a real friend to liberty, or that ever ſincerely wiſhed to render his people truly happy. A great and awful leſſon to all the princes of the world;—not a leſſon teaching mildneſs; attention to complaints; an ear to the friends of innovation; a protection of arts, and literature, and philoſophy; not an inſtruction to enlighten; not a call to teach the ignorant; not a wiſh to ſoften power into perſuaſion, or to change the ſtern dictates of authority for the mild voice of humanity and feeling. NO: this great abomination

abomination demands other ſentiments; and ought to generate (for the real felicity of the human race) a tighter rein in the jaws of that monſter, the worſt and moſt hideous caricature of human depravity, the metaphyſical, philoſophical, atheiſtical, Jacobin republican;—abhorred for ever, for holding out to all the ſovereigns of the earth, that the only prince who ever voluntarily placed bounds to his own power,—DIED FOR IT ON THE SCAFFOLD; and ruined his people, while he deſtroyed himſelf. He gave ear to thoſe who told him of abuſes; he wiſhed to *eaſe* his people; he ſought popularity; he allowed the liberty of the preſs, and would not reſtrain even its licentiouſneſs; he cheriſhed the arts, to produce a David, and nouriſhed, in the boſom of protected ſcience, a Condorcet *; he would not ſhed the blood of traitors, conſpirators, and rebels †; he liſtened to

* That is to ſay, the virtuous meritorious character, of whom we have peers who have publickly declared themſelves *proud of his correſpondence.* Let thoſe who would wiſh to know him well, read his character in *La Methrie Journal Phyſique*, and the memoirs of the aſſaſſination of the Duke de la Rochefoucauld.

† And this humanity called on his memory the abominably unfeeling remark, which I have ſomewhere read, in the regiſter, I ſuppoſe, of ſome night cellar, that *the phyſical pain he ſuffered in his execution was leſs than the ſlow torments of La Fayette.* Did the *innocent* Louis declare that *inſurrection*, by which they both fell, to be *the moſt ſacred of duties?* And are the children of the author of that ſentiment clinging to the knees of a father leading to execution? The more Jacobiniſm we read, the more amiable it appears.

thoſe who petitioned for a REFORM.—We also have thoſe who demand a REFORM:—and when the legiſlature of this kingdom, unwarned by this great example, ſhall liſten to the doctrines that have drenched France with blood, we alſo may ſee ſpectacles too horrid now to think of; did not the late tragedy tell us, that no iniquity is too black for republican reformation.

This damned event, deep written in the characters of hell, has thrown a ſtupor over mankind: when the princes and legiſlators of the world recover from it, the obſervation of Machiavelli, will not probably be forgotten: *Perche con pochiſſimi eſſempi ſarai più pietoſo, che quelli li quali per troppa pietà laſciano ſeguire i diſordini onde naſchino occiſioni o rapine.*

It is well enough amongſt men who never ſee a remote cauſe, when an immediate one is before them, to attribute this deep ſtain in human annals, to the butchers who are in the Convention; in like manner the ambition of Cromwell was the direct cauſe of the death of Charles I.: but theſe are not the firſt cauſes; they are rather the natural reſult of preceding events. It is not Roberſpiere and Egalité that have murdered Louis, it was Neckar with his *double tiers*; it is PERSONAL REPRESENTATION to which this horrible crime, preceded (and which will be followed) by ſo many others, is alone to be attributed. And ſhould ever

ſimilar

ſimilar deeds again blot the national character of this kingdom, it is not the wretches who ſhall form ſome diſtant convention of anarchy, to whom the miſchief ſhould be attributed, but to our REFORMERS; to our Jacobin advocates for *improving* our repreſentation; for doing that here which has deluged France in her beſt blood.

Page 82.—*Multitude de faux.*

They have their own *conventional* forgeries as well as others, for it is a curious circumſtance that the new aſſignats are iſſued without being numbered, and conſequently may be by *milliards* inſtead of millions: this has been aſſerted in the Convention, and yet uncontradicted. Of the ſame complection is the fact, that in the Moniteur the National Gazette; the price of the louis d'or in aſſignats, has not been publiſhed for ſome months paſt, which was always regularly done before.

Page 86.—*Kept inſecurely.*

There is a paſſage, in Swift's Draper's Letters, which accounts fully for gold and ſilver ſo abſolutely diſappearing in France; I change only *Wood's pence* for *aſſignats*.—" For my own part I am already reſolved what to do; I have a pretty good ſhop of ſtuffs and ſilks, and inſtead of taking *aſ-*

ſignats,

ſignats, I intend to truck with my neighbours, the butcher, and baker, and brewer, and the reſt, goods for goods; and the little gold and ſilver I have, I WILL KEEP BY ME LIKE MY HEART'S BLOOD, TILL BETTER TIMES, till I am juſt ready to ſtarve, and then I will buy *aſſignats*."

Page 90.—*Corn enough in the country.*

"By means of revolutions," ſays Paine, "civilization will be left to the enjoyment of that abundance, of which it is now deprived."—The abundance produced by revolutions is a text for Frenchmen to preach on.

Page 15.—*Go to Rights of Man.*

The authority of future aſſemblies, ſays Paine, *will be to legiſlate according to the principles preſcribed in the conſtitution; and if experience ſhould ſhew, that alterations are neceſſary, they will not be left to the diſcretionary power of the government.* Before his book was well circulated, that future government pulled down the conſtitution. He goes on:—*A government ariſing out of ſociety, cannot have the right of altering itſelf; if it had, it would be arbitrary.* Here he levels point blank the ſyſtem he wrote five hundred pages to ſupport. Then the French government IS arbitrary.

Page 86.—*Religion.*

The point of religion, *politically* conſidered, is a great and arduous queſtion, which demands talents fully to examine and arrange, greater perhaps than any other branch of legiſlation. The ableſt men of the age, ſeem rather to ſplit on this rock than to eſcape it. When I read in a tract a complaint of the author, that, *becauſe he objects to particular religious tenets, he has been repreſented as an enemy of order and of government*; and in the ſame tract meet with the aſſertion, that *the revolution of the* 10*th of Auguſt, was a happy and neceſſary completion of that of the* 14*th of July*, I ſee an inſtance which affords a proof of this. The latter ſentiment makes one's blood run cold, for it implies more than it profeſſes. Freezing with its effect, I turned haſtily to the end of the work, to ſee if it was not explained (as the publication took place after the death of the King) in a chapter of additions and corrections; but no ſuch matter. The queſtion comes ſurely with force; is ſuch a man repreſented as an enemy of government, on account of his *religious tenets*, or on account of his *political opinions?*

When ſuch ſentiments are abroad, and even gloried in, and found moſt wonderfully connected, one knows not how, with religious tenets, infinitely difficult becomes the buſineſs, I will not ſay

of

of toleration, but of the whole ſyſtem of legiſlation, ſo far as it connects with religion. Would you have a unitarian take a ſeat on the bench of biſhops? Religious reaſons have not yet been given why they ſhould not. But would you have a man there who publickly declares, that the revolution of the 10th of Auguſt was a HAPPY one? No; moſt aſſuredly. Hence then, in the *repeal* of teſts and ſubſcriptions, are they to be conſidered as levelled againſt heterodox doctrines of religion; or, as political ſecurities, that the power and emoluments of the church ſhall be lodged with men whoſe opinions do not tend to the utter deſtruction of our admirable conſtitution IN STATE? And further, if there are any particular ſects of religion, whoſe profeſſors are generally tinctured with republicaniſm and Jacobiniſm, will any man of common ſenſe ſuppoſe, that the non-repeal of teſts and reſtrictions perſiſted in merely on religious motives?

Page 87.—*Aſſociations.*

There is one object in aſſociations which has not been thought of, but which would, perhaps, be as uſeful and effective as any other, and that is, for aſſociators to reſolve againſt dealing with any ſort of Jacobin tradeſmen: if the atrocity of attempts to alter a conſtitution, which ſo effectually protects property, as that of England does, on compariſon with

with any other that Europe ſees, be well conſidered, the ſupineneſs of mankind, in giving encouragement to thoſe whoſe utmoſt efforts are aimed at its deſtruction, will ſurely appear the moſt marvellous ſtupidity. Who, acquainted with the *complections* of men, in any town in England, does not ſometimes hear the wealth of the diſaffected made a boaſt of? If you name the danger of the political principles of certain men to property—you hear it exclaimed, *How? Do you conſider the wealth of ſuch and ſuch perſons? Are they not rich? Have they not a ſtake?* Yes; they have a ſtake; commonly as moveable as their perſons, and therefore the readineſs with which they hazard public confuſion. But whence this boaſt of property? Becauſe, probably, the landed-men in their vicinity, and the monied-men of other principles, have, with this groſs blindneſs, which I at preſent allude to, been for years in the habit of aſſiſting ſuch diſaffected republican Jacobin reformers, to accumulate that wealth which is now ready to be employed in their own deſtruction: they have been paying their incomes into the hands of men who are ready to convert the intereſt they make upon it to the eſtabliſhment of a Convention in England, to conſiſt of brother citizens of equality; to ſubſcribe money, food, cloaths, and arms for the aſſaſſins and regicides of France, to enable them, by ſucceſs at home, to ſubdue the *vices of the Britiſh conſtitution*

ſtitution by a radical reform. This ſupine inattention, which turns a man's money to his own deſtruction, is highly reprehenſible. Let thoſe who are real friends to the conſtitution expend their income with men whoſe principles are known—and not become, unthinkingly, promoters of ſedition, and encouragers of republicaniſm. Go amongſt ſectaries of various denominations, political and religious, and examine if the individuals are not attentive to this point.

Page 100.—*Right to relieve.*

But Paine thinks differently of our *no* conſtitution.—" The country governs itſelf at its own expence, by means of magiſtrates, juries, ſeſſions, and aſſize;—what is called government, is only boundleſs extravagance." This is one of the falſe and flippant remarks of that endleſs prevaricator, who has not fact to ſupport him in more than one of a thouſand aſſertions. What are magiſtrates without the controul of ſeſſions, but tyrants? What would ſeſſions be without the King's Bench? What would the King's Bench be without a ſuperior? You can finiſh in none of theſe ſteps without tyranny being the conſequence. It is the gradation and controul of powers which forms the true balance. It is THE CROWN that keeps all theſe meaner ſtars in their reſpective orbits: there is no ſimilar power in France, and *therefore* all is confuſion and tyranny. The admirable utility of magiſtrates,

ſeſſions, aſſize, &c. are felt and admitted:—you would have this without a ſupreme magiſtrate,—that is, you would have attraction without matter, and ſolar heat without a ſun.

Paine is fond of running paralells, and ſo are moſt men of genius; but he is rarely happy in them:—"The generality of the people in America," ſays he, "eſpecially the poor, are more able to pay taxes than the generality of people either in France or England." And he unites with this, the "cruelty" of a civil liſt of a million ſterling, which he compares with the civil liſt of America, which is only 300,000 dollars. One muſt ſearch many writers with talents, to find one who can compreſs ſuch multitudes of falſehoods and blunders into the ſame ſpace with this captain-general of mountebanks.

The ability to pay taxes does not depend on a people being at their eaſe,—that is, having few or no indigent poor. This aſſertion will ſeem a paradox only to the ignorant. That ability depends on the quantity, number, and rapidity of *money exchanges*; in other words, on CONCENTRATED CIRCULATION. The eaſe, the plenty, and happineſs of the people have nothing to do in this buſineſs; for give a man a thouſand acres of rich land, which produces beef, mutton, pork, wheat, wool, hemp, flax, &c. to profuſion; let the family that poſſeſs it, live in the utmoſt conceivable plenty, there does not reſult from this outline

the

the capability of paying one ſhilling of taxes. Even taxes on ſolid property, like land-taxes, muſt be paid by *caſh in circulation:* land does not pay a land-tax, but *money*. It is not, therefore, the *eaſe* of the people that enables them to pay, but the ſuperfluity that goes beyond that eaſe. In the conſumption of a thouſand pound's worth of products forming the eaſe, the phyſical "ability" mentioned by Paine, what is the taxable amount? Poſſibly not a penny beyond the conſumption of foreign wine, coffee, ſpices, &c. I uſed the expreſſion *concentrated* circulation; America, if ſhe wanted heavy taxes, would feel what it means: let a ſettler in the woods, two hundred miles from a city, ſell his hemp or his wool to a ſtore-keeper for money, there is a ſtep in circulation where the ſtate might levy a tax; but in a wild country, it would coſt ten times more to levy it, than the tax would be worth. We know what diſtilleries are in the Highlands of Scotland; the Americans have that tax alſo, but they can levy it only in peopled diſtricts: nay, there are diſtricts in America, where the land-tax will not pay for the collecting!! It would be eaſy to purſue theſe obſervations to demonſtration; and to ſhew, that the reverſe of his propoſition is true, and that the people of England and of France *(before the revolution, for nothing ſince has circulated but blood and rapine)* are infinitely more able to pay taxes than

thoſe of America, for this plain reaſon, that they have a circulation infinitely more rapid.

When I conſider the boundleſs wealth of this kingdom; its enormous conſumption; its rapid circulation of 40 millions ſterling, in gold and ſilver, and of paper to an infinitely greater amount; its exportation and importation, which, if valued truly, would exceed 50 millions ſterling; the facilities of movement, exchange, transfer, of life, if I may uſe the expreſſion ariſing, from the ſize of our cities and the maſs of our circulation; I ſhould think it a moderate calculation to ſay, that in caſe of any unforeſeen emergency of the ſtate, that called for ſome great exertion, it would be eaſier to raiſe, by taxation in Great Britain, five pounds a head on the people than it would be to raiſe 5s. a head in America: for in taxation, ſpeaking at large of a nation, the quantum *paid*, is not ſo much the object to regard as the quantum *left* after taxes are paid. Suppoſe the people of one country pay 20s. a head, and the people of another country 40s. (not very far from the fact of England and France)—what does this prove? Juſt nothing. What is left in their pockets after the tax is paid? There is the inquiry; and in the Engliſhman's pocket you would find a purſe of guineas and ſhillings*; in the Frenchman's, the

* The maſs of our taxes is not ſo great an evil as their inequality; the burthens paid by a country gentleman, of ſmall eſtate, are hideous, and leaves him, like the Frenchman, with empty pockets.

maladie

maladie de la poche, vacuity. Perhaps the happieſt and moſt enviable people in America, the *comfortable* freeholder, in the back country, is, of all the men in Europe or America, the one leaſt able to pay taxes. What do I deduce from this? That the compariſon of the Engliſh civil liſt of 898,468l. *, amounting to 1s. 7½d. a head is not at all unreaſonable, when compared with the American civil liſt of 300,000 dollars, (66,000l.), or 5¼d a head. But no compariſon can be drawn juſtly, between a new country that did not form itſelf and an old one that did, and now pays the expence of forming that new one. Let the American account be charged with the expence of the war of 1756, or one hundred millions, and then compare taxation.

Page 85.—*Anarchy.*

If any doubt could be entertained whether Paine's principles were thoſe of *real* reformation or of anarchy, it would be removed by his declaring, *I am contending for the rights of the living, againſt their being controuled by the manuſcript authority of the dead.* This is a direct revolt againſt the authority of all LAW; he meant it againſt government, and did not ſee that it applies equally againſt law, and every link of civilization.

* Sir John Sinclair's Hiſtory of the Public Revenue, vol. ii. p. 76.

Page 92.—*Abuſes.*

But if this maxim had always governed, where would our preſent liberty have been? It was reforming abuſes that gave us our preſent conſtitution. Admirable logic! Becauſe when you had a bad conſtitution you changed to get a good one; *therefore* having a good one, you ſhould change to get a better? The Italian, who being well, took phyſic to be better, ſeems a caſe in point.

Page 4.—*Experimenter.*

This circumſtance of there being men who having been friends to the revolution, before the 10th of Auguſt, yet continue friends to it, proves clearly one of two things; that they are either republicans, and therefore only approved of the revolution before the 10th of Auguſt as a ſtep to the 21ſt of January, thinking, with Dr. Prieſtly, the revolution of the 10th *neceſſary and* HAPPY;—or, that they have changed their principles. The revolution before the 10th of Auguſt, was as different from the revolution after that day, as light from darkneſs; as clearly diſtinct in principle and practice, as liberty and ſlavery; for the ſame man to approve therefore of both, he muſt either be uncandid or changeable; uncandid in his approbation before that period; changeable in his approbation

probation after it. How little reaſon therefore for reproaching me with ſentiments contrary to thoſe I publiſhed before the 10th of Auguſt! I am not changeable but ſteady and conſiſtent, the ſame principles which directed me to approve the revolution, in its commencement (the principles of real liberty), led me to deteſt it after the 10th of Auguſt. The reproach of changeableneſs or *ſomething worſe*, belongs entirely to thoſe who did *not* then change their opinion, but approve the *republic*, as they had approved the *limited monarchy*.

Monſ. de Mounier's juſt character of Louis XVI. here merits quoting:—"The abuſes in France were prior to the reign of Louis XVI.: a debt of five milliards (218,750,000l.) exiſted when he mounted the throne. Never was the crown of France worn by a prince who was more the friend of humanity. A tender father and huſband; an enemy of all faſt and prodigality; full of reſpect for public law, he was anxious to do all the good that was in his power. The *corvées* aboliſhed; the torture ſuppreſſed; the miſerable condition of thoſe in hoſpitals and priſons eaſed; the reformation of our abſurd criminal juriſprudence begun; the provincial adminiſtrations inſtituted; the ſervitude of the *glebe* aboliſhed in his domains; civil rights reſtored to thoſe who do not profeſs the catholic

catholic religion; the navy raiſed from annihilation; new ports created; commerce extended by the moſt uſeful public eſtabliſhments. What titles theſe for the gratitude of his people! Even in his errors he was ſtill guided by the love of his ſubjects; and it is hatred againſt abuſes, and his too facile goodneſs, that precipitated him from his throne. It is ſhocking to think, that with a mind leſs beneficent, another prince might perhaps have found the means of preſerving his power." *Recherches ſur les cauſes, &c.* Tom. i. p. 23. Louis, *who, very different from the general claſs called by that name, is a man of a good heart*, is the character of this prince given by the incendiary Paine, whoſe writings contributed to bring him to the block.

5 JA 59

THE END.